

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80137
Title of the Manuscript:	EPISTAXIS: PATHOPHYSIOLOGY AND ITS MANAGEMENT
Type of the Article	Review 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

	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>Although, the article is presenting one of very important subjects in rhinology specifically, and in the medicine generally, but its elucidation as article for publication was so weak, either in relation to the basic principles of writing of reviewing article, or the following of internationally established organization and items ordering, starting from the abstract up to the references. In addition, this article is appearing as essential chapter in basic hand notes ENT book rather than that article which describing the most recent and advanced aspects and guidelines regarding the epistaxis. I.e. the informations, which postulated at this article, were very basic and well known even by most junior physicians and ENT speciality practices. In accordance, there are many non-conclusive and non-relevant informtions as the consideration of the von-wille brand disease as primary cause for epistaxis and haemophilia as secondary cause for epistaxis!!.. Also the mentioning of septal hematoma and cerebellar abscess as well as toxic shock syndrome as complications of epistaxis (HOW THIS?!)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Language is poor with many grammar as well as spelling mistakes - Un-necessary repetitions at many paragraphs. - Use of non- recommended, non-established abbreviations as IV - The writing is not according to the general recommendations for the article writing basic principles. - The references presentation was not following the VANCOUVER method. - No new knowledge illustrated at this article regarding this very important subject. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>By reviewing this article, I feel that either junior general practicing doctors or other health care workers as nurses rather than expertise that related to the rhinology or at least ENT field had been wrote it.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khaled Mohamed Bofares
Department, University & Country	Omar AL Moukhtar University, Libya