

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_118159
Title of the Manuscript:	A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study of Proteoglycan and Phosphatidylserine for Knee and Hip Pain
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it can help to set and research more dimensions of compound that were actually main component of this study. Also, researcher can work to reduce side effects of agents that have been used to reduce the pain.</p> <p>It is better but should need to be change and Mold scientifically.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but there were some minor mistakes while making sub sections and adjusting content.</p> <p>Yes, but more improvement can made on the bases of further experiments in future.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is appropriate but more new vocabulary can be added to upgrade the quality of content.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub heading should be more appropriate and must sound relevant to scientific data, you are providing in the mentioned content. Also, do not merge content or heading into specific section. Write each and every section clearly with relevant data only. • Total number of participants were not mentioned in methodology. Moreover, it's not showing number of male and female participants in study design. • Summary of findings should add in concluding part. 	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Nisar
Department, University & Country	University of Karachi, Pakistan