

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77503
Title of the Manuscript:	Nocturnal Enuresis in primary schools Children (6-12 years) of Tabuk City, Saudi Arabia
Type of the 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>This is an interesting manuscript, however in its present form I feel that it is not ready for submission. In order to improve upon the manuscript, the authors need to expand the abstract to include more information rather than brief sentences under each heading. My suggestion to the authors with the revise the manuscript to add more details with respect to rationale for the study utilizing previous studies and references.</p> <p>The article title and abstract are appropriate. The purpose of the article and its significance is not stated clearly. The study methods are not sound and appropriate. The writing is clear and concise. The conclusions or summary are not accurate and supported by the content. The article is of interest to members of the education research community.</p> <p>Overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript. The introduction is relevant and theory based. Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. The methods are generally appropriate, although clarification of a few details and provision of a rationale for the use of this particular method should be provided. Overall, the results are clear and compelling with two possible exceptions. The authors make a systematic contribution to the research literature in this area of investigation. The longitudinal nature of the work is a welcome addition. Overall, this is a high quality manuscript that has implications for the theoretical basis. However, the relevance to nursing per is uncertain.</p> <p>This manuscript has a great deal of promise, as does the study. My recommendation would be to focus time and attention on condensing your literature review and adding clarity between that and your theoretical framework. Additionally, the discussion and implications could be far more developed and the suggested pieces of action be more carefully delineated in a way that clearly borrows from your frame.</p> <p>My greatest concern is the lack of attention to the potential issues with using only one set of faces (if that is in fact what is being reported here). If the same set of cards are being used, it should be clear why that decision was made and how that may influence the outcomes.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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:	Morteza Alibakhshikenari
Department, University & Country	Stirling University, Scotland