

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77092
Title of the Manuscript:	TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PLANNED TEACHING ON KNOWLEDGE REGARDING MID-WIFE LED CONTINUITY OF CARE MODEL (MLCC) ON FINAL YEAR NURSING STUDENTS.
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>)

[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>I SUGGEST CHANGING THE JOB TITLE: EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PLANNED TEACHING ON THE KNOWLEDGE OF NURSING STUDENTS ON THE CONTINUITY OF CARE MODEL LEADED BY A MIDDLEWARE</p> <p>I SUGGEST TO JOIN THE TWO OBJECTIVES: To assess the knowledge and effectiveness of planned teaching of nursing students on the midwife-led model of continuity of care.</p> <p>ABSTRACT: the abstract there was a citation. Review by the journal's rules whether it can or not. I suggest making a summary without citation.</p> <p>METHOD: Is it an educational intervention study? It is not clear in the summary method.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <p>I missed the introduction of talking about nursing knowledge about the continuity of care model leaded by a middleman.</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHOD:</p> <p>The method contains incomplete information. The author did not explain whether the instrument used is validated, as was the choice. It did not describe whether the study passed the ethics committee. There is no information on the statistical analysis and study design (eg whether it is an educational intervention study)</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <p>Review the formatting and limit of tables and graphs that the journal accepts. Please include the source if the case was created by the authors and be more objective when presenting the data. I suggest that instead of presenting the graphics, describe the results in a descriptive way.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>I suggest removing the subtitles in the discussion.</p> <p>The discussion at the beginning looks like the information should be included in the results and not in the discussion. I suggest reviewing whether the journal's norms can gather results and discussion.</p> <p>I suggest writing the text always in the third person singular.</p> <p>I missed the discussion of bringing studies that talk about the knowledge of students about MLCC, as the object of study is the students. It is important to further support the discussion by bringing other studies.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>I suggest that you respond to the objectives brought up in the studies; bring the main limitations and suggest further studies.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	OBJECTIVES: I suggest reviewing the need to include the 3 specific objective. KEYWORDS: review the keywords.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Jhuliano Silva Ramos de Souza
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Alfnas, Brazil