

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JPRI_80325 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Menstrual Hygiene Management: A Literature Review |
| 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>

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>This paper is about hygiene management of menstruation in India. It seems that some interesting contents are included, but it is necessary to organize the description method and order of the contents. We recommend that you rewrite it in consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The content of the introduction is too small compared to the content of the abstract. I think it is better to enhance the introduction as a place to write the background of the dissertation. On the other hand, the abstract should show the approximate content of the dissertation (it can be left as it is, but it may be reduced).- I feel that the latter half is okay, but since the numerical data is not shown for the first half, I don't know if the content represents the whole or just an example. If possible, it's a Review manuscript, so why not reorganize multiple data to create a chart? | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The content of the keywords is often duplicated, so we recommend reconsidering it. | |
| Optional/General comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- I think the content of the "Aim" section does not match the title.- I do not think that the parts shown in 1) etc. are necessary.- There is a section called "Menstrual Health Management in India", but are you writing about India only here? From the conclusion, it seems that it shows the situation in the rural areas of India, so it would be better to summarize some areas of India as a whole. | |

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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: | <i>Jun Kobayashi</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>University of Kochi, Japan</i> |