

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81005
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness Regarding Dengue Fever among Patients Visiting Medical OPD
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>The paper needs major revision. Language needs to be improved. I tried to start doing corrections in the manuscript in order to make it readable but after 1 page lost the patience. Besides improving the language the major issues related to the paper are</p> <p>(i) Material and Methods –</p> <p>(a) It is not clear as to how the level of knowledge, awareness and preventive practices of the participants were assessed / scored as Good, Average and Poor. This needs to be detailed in this section as it is the main theme of the paper and should be clear to the readers.</p> <p>(b) Basis for determining sample size may be given</p> <p>(c) Statistical methods used in analysis should be mentioned</p> <p>(ii) Discussion - It is almost non-existent. This needs to be written properly comparing the results of the present study with other studies</p> <p>(iii) References - Although a total of 13 references have been provided, yet only 2 references have been cited in the text. All references must be cited at appropriate places in the text</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is poorly written and does not add to ant thing new on the existing knowledge on the subject. Further, I feel that this kind of study does not fit in to the scope of the journal. However, if Editor feels that paper merits publication the same can be done after major revision addressing the issues as raised by me and addressing my queries raised in the text box on the manuscript in track change mode</p>	

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:	Anil Prakash
Department, University & Country	ICMR - National Institute for Research in Environmental Health, India