

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78173
Title of the Manuscript:	"A STUDY TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PLANNED TEACHING PROGRAMME ON KNOWLEDGE REGARDING AND MANAGEMENT OF PRE- ECLAMPSIA AMONG ANTENATAL MOTHERS".
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:

<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the discussion, it is necessary to explain the content of the planned teaching programmed on knowledge regarding management of pre-eclampsia among antenatal mothers in this study.</li> <li>2. A more detailed discussion is needed regarding the statement that the planned teaching program was effective in gaining the knowledge regarding management of pre-eclampsia among antenatal mothers.</li> <li>3. The discussion should be further developed, how are the results of this study related to other research results that are similar or related to the topic in this research?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	It would be better if the descriptive analysis data (age, place of residence, educational status, religion, family income, type of family, knowledge level, etc.) were tabulated in the form of a result table or presented in graphical form to make it easier to read and understand.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This article is quite good and deserves to be published with several revisions that have been suggested by reviewers to become a better article and have high scientific value.	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Roselina Panghiyangani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lambung Mangkurat University, Indonesia</b>