

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_74879
Title of the Manuscript:	Assess the effectiveness of self-instructional module on knowledge regarding cultural beliefs of dietary habits among postnatal women
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:

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

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In Abstract : objectives can be combined and write general objectives Conclusion is not written in terms of effectiveness of SIM, lots of sentences formation mistakes...kindly relook Keywords: add effectiveness, Knowledge, SIM</p> <p>In Result Section: In Table 1: In Age variable... percentage is not calculated rightly so total should come out to be 100% Table 2: As you mentioned in research article that minimum score was 2 but when i see your range score in poor level of knowledge... it is 1-5...kindly check and correct it. Table 3.. As you mentioned in research article that minimum score was 9 but when i see your range score in poor level of knowledge... it is 1-5...kindly check and correct it. Why you calculated Standard deviation along with mean difference.... remove standard deviation only write mean differencestandard deviation always write along with mean which you already mentioned.</p> <p>In conclusion : Rewrite the conclusionas the nutshell of your study....donot use word degree of knowledge...appropriate term is level of knowledge.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In material and Methods: in First line , sentence formation is not ok...research design need to relook.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>ANALYSIS OF ASSOCIATION IS NOT DONE AS YOU MENTIONED IN research abstract...so add analysis or table</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Simarjeet Kaur</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Maharishi Markandeshwar (Deemed To Be Univeristy), India</i>