

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78779
Title of the Manuscript:	Post operative physiotherapy management of carcinoma of squamous cell: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case study

### **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>)

### **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>The abstract only mentions generalities of squamous cell carcinoma, by the title it is assumed that the main idea or what is relevant is the management that was given to the patient with physiotherapy. Therefore the author must complete and improve the abstract, it only has 110 words and generally between 250 and 300 words are accepted in the abstract.</p> <p>The author must improve the structure and writing of the article, to be a clinical case it is too long, it is badly written; The part that refers to physiotherapy does not give it the importance mentioned in the title, if it was a control then it should be mentioned both in the abstract and when presenting the clinical case (number the days with physiotherapy that according to the text was a week) , The part where it talks about its protocol can be placed in a table or a diagram to make it more attractive and understandable for the reader, and the author must refer The table in the text, the results, even if you place the table, should explain them, highlight why your study or this case is important and what makes it different or why it should be published.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The image is for others, it is not symbolic or representative, the same and could be removed,</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Maybe you should change the keyword "quality of life" since in your article you do not talk about it, the one with improvement does not express the quality of life, for this there are instruments and scales that you do not use in your article. I suggest you change it, perhaps for cancer, otherapeutics, exercises or another that occurs to you.</p>	

[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>Alejandra Giselle Juarez Rebollar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mexico</b>