

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78216
Title of the Manuscript:	To Assess the Effectiveness of Video Assisted Teaching Programme On Knowledge Regarding Prevention Of Covid-19 Among Antenatal Mother.
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

### **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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

## Review Form 1.6

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In abstract the author mention expected result and conclusion. He has not mentioned the study final result. He is talking about futuristic result. He should not use will and should in result section. See highlighted part.</p> <p><b>Expected Results:</b> At selected Maternity hospitals, this study will assess the effectiveness of video assisted teaching programme on knowledge regarding prevention of Covid-19 Among Antenatal Mother. After intervention, the level of knowledge in antenatal mother should be improved, .</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Final conclusion is drawn from the ultimate results of the statistical review.</p> <p>Write result in detail as per objective 1, 2 and 3. Mention statistical analysis in result section.</p> <p>Reframe the schematic diagram. Hide the name of setting. Mention time and duration of data collection like march-2020 to Nov 2021. Reference is style is not as per journal guideline.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The study is good and very important, but it seems few of lacking points that need to be strengthen. Result section is very poorly explained. Write the abstract properly. Mention the duration of data collection. Study objective should be reflected in result section.</p> <p>Kindly find the attached manuscript correction highlighted or see show comment.</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>Vipin Vageriya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Charusat University, India</b>