

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75668
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULE ON KNOWLEDGE REGARDING HOME CARE MANAGEMENT OF THALASSEMIA CHILDREN AMONG THE PARENTS”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title:</b> It should not start with word "TO". Title should also include your Study area  <b>"ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MODULE ON KNOWLEDGE REGARDING HOME CARE MANAGEMENT OF THALASSEMIA CHILDREN AMONG THE PARENTS....."</b></p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> It is too lengthy.  <b>Introduction:</b> Necessity of study not indicated. It not indicates Knowledge gap and Novelty/relevance.            Aims &amp; Objectives of study not stated (not clear).  <b>Material and Methods:</b>  <b>Study population</b> not clearly defined (Inclusion and Exclusion criteria not mentioned). How study participants were recruited?  <b>Sampling Method and Sample size</b> not mentioned  <b>Study area</b> (where study was conducted) not mentioned  <b>Study Tools:</b> Details about study tools not given.  <b>Data collection</b> process was not clear.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> Title of Table 2 was not given proper way</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Not concentrated around objectives</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Recommendation not based on observation, they are from authors mind.</p> <p><b>References:</b> Include some recent references</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Many Sentences were not properly framed (Grammatically incorrect)	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	<b>Anjana Tiwari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Late Shri Laxhi Ram Agrawal Memorial Government Medical College, India</b>