

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_74439
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF STRESS AMONG IT PROFESSIONALS UNDERGOING WORK FROM HOME
Type of the 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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>There is a need to improve the writing style.</p> <p>Include the questionnaire containing 27 questions in Material and Methods.</p> <p>Include the responses according to each question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title needs correction. • The word “undergoing” mentioned in the title can be replaced with the word “Performing”. • The questionnaire circulated among the participants needs to be shown under the “Material and Methods”. • In the entire paper, the percentages are given with two decimals accuracy. The percentages could have reported with one decimal accuracy. For example, 81.75% of 181 is 111.99 ≈112 and 81.8% of 181 is 112.06 ≈112. This is sufficient to show that one decimal accuracy (81.75% ≈ 81.8%) is enough in reporting the results. • It is a good practice to show the reliability of the questionnaire by reporting the Cronbach alpha or by reporting the correlations between the individual item scores as against the total score of the individual and then checking for the significance of the correlations obtained. • The authors' writing style is very primitive and needs improvement. For example, see the results described for Fig. 1. It is stated that Blue indicates no and green indicates Yes. The above conclusions can be drawn from the legends given along with the figure, so, where is the need to write this in results. • It is appreciated if the authors give the responses separately for each question and show them in a tabular form. • The authors could have even generated a composite stress score for each individual and then would have categorized them as Mild, Moderate and Severe, giving percentage of subjects falling in each category. This way of representation would have left more clarity in the minds of readers about the results. • The titles are not provided for the figures given in the text. Further, the legends given are in relatively smaller font. For the better visibility of the results, the font of the legends can be increased. • The authors may improve the paper writing keeping in 	

Review Form 1.6

		view the suggestions offered and may resubmit the paper for reconsideration. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The paper in the present form is not acceptable for the publication.	
Minor REVISION comments			
Optional/General comments			

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramnath Takiar
Department, University & Country	Indian Council of Medical Research Bangalore, India