

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81036
Title of the Manuscript:	A study of Nasal Septal Deviation, External Nasal Deformities, and their Correlation with the Severity of Sino-nasal Symptoms Using Sino Nasal Symptoms Score Questionnaire
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.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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author does not mention how the internal nasal valve will be measured using 30 degree endoscope in the Diagnostic nasal endoscopy in the methodology section. Please provide details of the measurement with appropriate references. • Author has included patients of Allergic Rhinitis in the study. It is known to cause hypertrophy of the inferior turbinates. So it will be a confounding factor in study sample. It is better if those patients are excluded from the study sample • The aim of the study needs to be changed. It does not match with the proposed objectives. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Please modify the last sentence in the 5th paragraph of the introduction.- “ most of the impact on the airflow is on the anterior deflections affecting the nasal valve, while in the middle and lower portion of the nares has no impact on resistance to airflow”</p> <p>Please change the word “accessed” with “examined” in the last sentence of the Introduction.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>References for the classification systems need to be from the original research article and not from the secondary authors. Kindly quote the original articles. For example., Refernces 4 and References 10,11 does not match with the corresponding classification systems described in this article.</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:	Nagaraj Maradi
Department, University & Country	India