

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78005
Title of the Manuscript:	PRE-EXPERIMENTAL STUDY TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF WARM COMPRESS ON LUMBAR REGION DURING FIRST STAGE OF LABOUR AMONG PRIMI PARTURIENT MOTHERS IN LABOUR ROOM OF SELECTED HOSPITALS AT AMRAVATI
Type of the Article	Original Article/Original Research

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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: At the beginning of the abstract, there is no description of the problem of this research. It is better if the abstract begins with the research problem (the gap between theory and reality at the research site).</p> <p>The three research objectives in the abstract can be combined into one sentence and each goal is separated by a comma (,) for example: The study aims to: assess the level of pain in primi parturient mothers during the first stage of labour, assess the effectiveness of warm compress on lumbar region, and determine the association between labour pain and selected demographic variables.</p> <p>At the end of the abstract should include suggestions in accordance with the results of the study</p> <p>Main Article In the introduction part : must be describe about gap between theory and phenomenon in the site of research or research problem.</p> <p>In this study didn't shown when and how long the study was conduted and this aspect mus be describe in this article. The researcher didn't explained about the how to conduct the study or how the procedure of</p> <p>For the result in demographic variable age and education for control group only 99% not 100%, for education, 99,8%</p> <p>For the table descriptions or reading tables of research results, it is enough to present the results with the highest scores and there is no need to read out all the contents of the table (for all of tabel of result study/ table 1-5)</p> <p>There was no discussion point about result of study? The discussion about result of study need used the theory, researcher opinion by data or theory, and related study.</p> <p>The conclusion must refer to the aims of study and must be describe about of suggestions in this article</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>In part of introduction for the theory or concepts like in the first paragraph can be shortened and supplemented with data related to research and the importance of research being carried out.</p> <p>For the related research in the end of introduction can be shortened and focus for the what, who, when, design (how) and result of the study with the effective sentences. And related research needs to be added by using articles from journals that will be publish.</p> <p>For population must be explain how much of total population, for the sample size based on population? Use the formula to determine sample? For the sample criteria could choose only the inclusion criteria.</p> <p>For the istruments was used, please explain about made by self or based on theory</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	or used the standard instrument ?	
Optional/General comments	Overall this article can be accepted to publish after revised	

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:	Wirda Hayati
Department, University & Country	Poltekkes Kementerian Kesehatan Indonesia (Poltekkes Kemenkes Aceh), Indonesia