

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79475
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON DEVIATED NASAL SEPTUM: CLASSIFICATION, CLINICAL FEATURES AND MANAGEMENT
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.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript needs to be reviewed by an English Medical Expert. I have read lots of unsuitable medical expressions.</p> <p>After correcting this manuscript, I recommend to read some books about "how to write a scientific manuscript". The author can find help on the internet.</p> <p>Check correct abbreviations of journal https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals</p> <p>The author should use the abbreviation from the beginning of the manuscript to the end, attached to the first line where he wrote the complete word.</p> <p>The abstract should express the background, method, goals, result and conclusion.</p> <p>Although some journal don't requires them, but the author should explain the goals and the results and conclusion of that manuscript.</p> <p>Keywords: Use one or maximum two words to refer every keyword, not four words. Don't use abbreviation as Keyword.</p> <p>Introduction: The author should be concise, and do not explain all the anatomical details of the nose. Remember that you need to explain everything about the classifications of the septal deviation.</p> <p>Objectives: They aren't clear.</p> <p>Methods: The author should explain the kind of study (e.g. retrospective study, case series). Also, reference correctly the database.</p> <p>Main text: The author should to be concise and describe the different classifications to explain the importance of these classifications.</p> <p>All the paragraphs need to be followed by their references.</p> <p>Conclusion: The author needs to rewrite again the conclusion completely. It isn't conclusion.</p> <p>References: Correct the structure of the reference, please.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alberto Raposo
Department, University & Country	Catholic University San Antonio of Murcia (UCAM), Spain