

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78818
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness of blood pressure changes during menstrual cycle
Type of the Article	Original research papers:

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

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Please see the detailed comments in the manuscript attached</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rewrite methods to include more information about participants. Last two sentences can be clubbed to get more space. 2. Check Grammar. It should be not be in present tense. 3. There is repeated text 4. Combine results and discussion in one section. Give more data in results, just giving <i>P</i> value is not enough for the readers to understand results 5. Please follow the authors guidelines with regard to reporting of <i>P</i> value. 6. My suggestion not to include keywords from title <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the significance of this study? 2. Is this study fill any gap in existing knowledge? 3. What forms the basis for this study? Why did you choose this study? 4. Above information should be given in a coherent manner to build your background and rationale for the study. Just merely writing the review is not all that constitute introduction part. <p>Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please elaborate your methods. Add more information about participants characteristics. What is age range, gender, ethnicity and any other relevant information about participants? 2. What is sampling procedure? How did you select sample? Is there any inclusion or exclusion criteria? 3. Did you take written informed consent from the participants? 4. Where is the ethical approval for the study? 5. Is this study conforms to Helsinki declaration? 6. Ethical approval code? 7. Please elaborate the questionnaire used in the study? 8. Which questionnaire was used? What is the reference to the questionnaire? 9. What is reliability and validity of questionnaire? 10. How did you administer the questionnaire? Give more details. 11. Please recheck grammar used in the manuscript, specially the tense, please have consistency in the tensed used in the manuscript 12. Information given about participants in the method is not in line with your conclusion and results. This appears to be a gross error and not advisable to ignore. As per your conclusion you have dental students, but your method says that you have adolescent students. (Which one is correct?) <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I suggest, this not how the discussion is written. You have just quoted previous studies here. Please interpret your findings in relation to these studies. What is your opinion on the findings? Proper analysis of findings is required. 2. In first paragraph you have mentioned the findings and in second paragraph you mentioned previous studies. This is not called discussion. Please rewrite with more impact and meaning. <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am surprised to see your conclusion. Conclusion are not in line with your methods, participants and findings. 2. You have concluded that female dental students have greater knowledge. My question is from where these dental students appear? There is no mention about dental students either in methods or in results. 3. In method, you mentioned, that you have selected 100 adolescent students. There is no mention about dental students? I did not see dental student in your results also. 	

Review Form 1.6

	This is very basic study Conclusion, findings and methodology does not relate to each other.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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> No ethical approval taken. No written informed consent taken from participant.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Tomar
Department, University & Country	Egypt