

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75509
Title of the Manuscript:	A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY ON KNOWLEDGE,ATTITUDE AND PERCEPTION OF UTERINE FIBROIDS AMONG WOMEN WITH FIBROIDS ATTENDING A TERTIARY HEALTH CARE CENTRE IN CHENNAI
Type of the Article	Short Research article/Short communication

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results-A sentence can't start with numeral.</li> <li>• Expand results, put in some more points.</li> <li>• Please state in past tense. Please put a scientific term such as positive/negative.</li> <li>• Conclusions- One line about what you conclude from study, such as poor knowledge and perception, it is incomplete in present form.</li> </ul> <p><b>Main article:</b></p> <p><b>Introduction-</b></p> <p>In end, before arriving at objectives of study, state the current status of KAP about fibromyomas, and if there is no data, say so.</p> <p><b>Methodology-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand Methodology, you can put certain diagnostic criteria, definition, scoring systems used to assess KAP in methods</li> <li>• Pre-formed questionnaire details are needed- Was the questionnaire validated or pilot tested if it was a self -made performa? How was it introduced (in native language/ English)? Was it filled by interviewer or self-filled by participant?</li> <li>• In statistical analysis mention -----Analysed using percentages and proportions to assess KAP or some other method you used.</li> <li>• Ethical- confidentiality statement</li> </ul> <p><b>Results:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of tables are neither mentioned or described in text which is mandatory. Some elements of tables (some questions) should also be described in results.</li> <li>• I have suggested point to point corrections in comments with track changes on for your help.</li> <li>• We need Table 2 description and mention in text describing its purpose and salient pointers apart from total knowledge and score.</li> <li>• Table 3 (scoring table): This needs to be in methods section preferably not in table form but as a descriptive statement such as- <b>To assess knowledge of the participants' correct response to each question was scored as 1, making it a total score of 11 for 11 questions. (Something like that).</b> So <b>table 3</b> is not required in results but in methods section. Same goes for <b>table 6 and 9.</b></li> </ul> <p>Table numbers 5,7 do not find mention in text. You can start the sentence as: As shown in table 5,7..... Describe a little bit about some questions and responses in table 5,7.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>A word count of 150-200 in abstract is considered good, so consider expanding a bit.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Consider including more points age, parity, symptomatology etc.</p> <p>You can put some words about factors responsible for poor perception in the end. Lack of health education at schools, colleges etc. How can we bring the change?</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Understanding table 8 and 10:</b></p> <p>As participants stating no in answers are presumptively having positive perception to the questions, so is it that lower the score, higher is the positive perception as in table 10...?</p> <p>Please describe your table 10</p> <p>Does scoring in perception even have a meaning?</p> <p>Overall average of positive perception (“No” response) in table 8 comes out to be nearly 70% which makes sense.</p> <p><b>Limitations:</b> A good study always states its limitations. Please consider.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Shruti Sharma</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Dayanand Medical College and Hospital, India</b></p>