

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77301
Title of the Manuscript:	A study to assess the effectiveness of the video-assisted teaching on anorexia nervosa among adolescent girls in selected colleges
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>Methodology must be rewrite Quasi experimental design looks cause and effect (relation between independent and dependent). So the authors are advised to see paired and chi-test and any other non parametric test. Mention the variables where the assessment has been taken. Mention the nature of questions in methodology and also the grading scale assessment technique that the authors used or followed. Distinct hypothesis In methodology if sample is school teachers than how adolescents is mentioned for evaluation. (may be typing mistake, please check) Results: Mention the score statistic of post test with p-value and test statistic. In results either incorporate table or figure/bar graph (both should be avoided)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Ask an English speaker to edit your revised manuscript, there are many words in your manuscript written wrongly, and seems cut and paste of synopsis or research proposal.	
Optional/General comments	I encouraged the authors that despite low research have been done so far in this important issue, the efforts made is appreciable and is recommended to revise the research paper as advised. It will be better to include more references in the discussion part so that associations of findings can be described.	

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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u> The consent of the subjects included in research program is must which is missing in the paper.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arif Habib Hanga
Department, University & Country	University of Kashmir, India