

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75354
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Planned Teaching on Knowledge Regarding Menstrual Blood Banking among Nursing Students
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

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	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>Abstract: is not compatible with the journal guideline some of the issues is a follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acronym MBB should be substituted by Menstrual Blood Banking (Non-standard abbreviations should be listed and full form of each abbreviation should be given in parentheses at first use in the text) • The methods should be merged and re-written, briefly, and clearly (e.g, start with study method? Who is the participant? Sample size and location be continued by sampling method and analyse methods) ethical code do not need to be mentioned in abstract. • expected result? If the study expects to be done in future, then change the tense of the verbs in all method's sections. <p>Introduction and Background of the study: (All should be merged and rewritten according to the Journal's guideline)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What this sentence exactly meant? (... Even though today's girls receive information through the media, it cannot be applied practically unless it is explained....) • We need more coherency in the introduction part. Also, merge introduction with the background, (e.g., you first spoke about the menarche age and then in the middle of the introduction you discussed about the menarche age again, etc.) • Menstruation is not a five-day-long we have a range for it.... • Lots of sentences left without reference. • In the introduction and background part we need a clear background, and problem definition, solution, evidence base data to supporting the idea and represent your study question and aim.... So, be more coherent and obey the introduction guideline. <p>Rationale of study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some information in this part is the same as the previous • Maybe it is better this part should be merged with the last two one and all necessity and importance of study be mentioned in one place <p>Method section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please be clearer in the method part. Do you mean to assess the knowledge of participant through interview? If yes? Explain about the interview and questionnaire!! If they were supposed to collect sample of their menstrual bleeding? Explain it. • What is your data? Explain about the collecting and coding and analysing? • Mentioning "Who are available during the period of data collection" as an inclusion criterion? Is not it a sampling method? • How were participants allocated to interventions? How intervention will be conducted? • how missed data will be managed? • What is your study question? Data should answer your study questions? <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the interview is a way of collecting the data, why do you speak about the menstrual blood sampling? • Important adverse events or side effects • What is study limitation? 	
Minor REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

	Check the structure of CONSORT and Journal guideline	
Optional/General comments	If the concept of the protocol is about the assessing the knowledge about Menstrual Blood Banking maybe it is not exactly in line with aim and scope of the Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International	

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:	Shiva Pourali Roudbaneh
Department, University & Country	University of Melbourne, Australia