

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77366
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Tension-Type headache among medical students in Tabuk University, Saudi Arabia
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>&lt;Major&gt;</b>                      #frequent TTH vs infrequent TTH vs chronic TTH: What is the definition of 'Frequent' or 'Infrequent' or 'Chronic'? Is it just the subjective impression of the students? Please clearly describe the definition.                      #A number of statistical analyses are performed. It is okay, but I cannot understand what it means for this paper to perform such a large number of statistical analyses. As a result of this, it is extremely difficult to understand, among these, even by reading the Ms carefully, what is actually important and what is actually not so important. The result section described about these statistics is hard to read, hard to understand, and, above all, very boring. In contrast, the figures and tables in this Ms are easy to understand, which, I think, can say something which is much more important than those boring statistics. Statistics is, after all, statistics. I think it better to limit the statistical analyses to a minimum.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>&lt;Minor&gt;</b>                      #'TTH': Once an abbreviation is introduced, it should be used thereafter. This is true for other abbreviations. In this Ms, 'tension-type headache', 'tension headache', or whatever persists even after 'TTH' is introduced. It is also strange that the full-spelling of TTH ('tension-type headache') is described even after the meaning of 'TTH' is fixed (ex. Introduction, last paragraph). This is so noisy a way to write a paper.                      #Abstract, Results: Here, only percentages are given (ex. 78.6%, 55.22%, 44.78%, 67.2%...or whatever). All of these percentages should be shown with its actual number (ex. response rate, 78.6%, n=○○).                      #Abstract, Conclusion, 'among Saudi students especially medical students': This sentence, in a strict sense, is incorrect. 'among Saudi medical students' is correct. This is because the subject of this study is just medical students, not including those in other fields.                      #Introduction, 2nd paragraph, 'ICHD-3': This should be referenced.                      #Introduction, 3rd paragraph, 'ETTH': This means episodic TTH? If so, it should have been introduced beforehand in the text.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>&lt;Grammar&gt;</b>                      #The Ms suffers from many grammatical errors or questionable expressions. The Ms needs to be proofread carefully again and again. Without correcting these errors, it is difficult for this paper to be published in any of medical journals.</p> <p>Ex                      -Abstract, background, line 1: 'Headaches disorders have' &gt; 'Headache disorders have' or 'Headaches have'                      -Abstract, background, line 1: 'Tension Type Headache' &gt; 'Tension-Type Headache (TTH)'. Once TTH is introduced, it should be used thereafter in the abstract.                      -Abstract, background, line 4, 'the importance of this study comes': This sentence is not incorrect, but it is too clumsy. How about this, like, 'it is important to study the prevalence of TTH among medical students'?                      -Abstract, Results:                      *were males their mean age was...years &gt; 'were males. Their mean age was...years' or 'were males, with their mean age being...years'</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>*The 1-year prevalence TTH &gt; The 1-year prevalence of TTH *frequent TTH 67.2%, 18.0% infrequent TTH &gt; frequent TTH 67.2%, infrequent TTH 18.0% *reported that headache aggravate &gt; 'reported that headaches aggravated' or 'reported headache aggravation' (?) -etc, etc, etc, throughout the Ms</p>	
--	--	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>K Ishizawa</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Saitama Medical University Moroyama Campus, Japan</i></b>