

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78378
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of chilled cabbage leaves versus hot application on breast engorgement among postnatal mothers in selected hospitals of Vadodara, Gujarat, India
Type of the Article	Original 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.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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Thank you so much for giving me this opportunity to review your work.</p> <p><b>ABSTRACT</b> It can be written that the mothers on which day after birth were taken.</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b> Intrroduction is not sufficient to present literature knowledge. It is recommended to be developed. Description should be given.</p> <p><b>METHODOLOGY</b> It is recommended that the information about the methodology should be in paragraph form, not in individual sub-headings.</p> <p><b>RESULT</b> It is not recommended to use vertical lines, number of questions (eg 1,2,3..) and answer options (eg: a,b..) in the table. Additional analysis is recommended to determine whether the women in the group are homogeneously distributed based on individual characteristics (eg, chi-square) The findings in Table 1 have been quite long. Shorter writing is recommended. Carriage returns must start with a capital letter. text should be checked thoroughly</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION</b> In the discussion part, the data of the findings should be at a minimum level. In addition, it is recommended to include more studies that support the literature in general in the discussion section.</p> <p><b>ETHICAL CLEARANCE</b> The approval number of the official institution permission letter of the research should be written.</p> <p>Reference references should be checked.</p> <p>It is recommended that the study be edited in terms of language.</p> <p>I wish you good work.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-	

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Esra Karataş Okyay</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Inonu University, Turkey</b>