

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMPS_84159 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF AWARENESS ABOUT HEART AMONG ADULTS IN QUETTA PAKISTAN |
| 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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>heart and problems associated with heart disease are considered very vital in an individual’s quality of life. Authors have conducted an important study on developing questionnaire on this issue. However, there are several issues that endanger the validity of the results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">One of the most important issues came out from the sample size estimation. The authors mentioned in the manuscript that “A sample size of 100 respondents, according to Rattray and Jones is sufficient for questionnaire design and development”; however, in the cited article it is also stated that “others would suggest that this is insufficient”. Besides, for each work, sample size should independently be estimated based on the study parameters and there is no absolute fixed cut off for study sample size. I ask the authors to estimate the sample size required for this study and add it to the manuscript.The authors have mentioned in the methods that 120 individuals were recruited; however, in the results, they pointed that the final analysis included a total of 100 respondents. I ask if the authors could explain the discrepancy. Was that due to missing or something else? It should be added to the manuscript.The manuscript needs to be edited for improvement of the use of English. | <p>1. Agreed, This score can be biased, especially in small sample sizes, as the item itself is included in the total score (Kline 1993). Therefore, to reduce this bias, a corrected item-total correlation should be calculated. This removes the score from the item from the total score from the questionnaire or domain (Bowling 1997) prior to the correlation. And we have added corrected item-total correlation.</p> <p>2. 120 were recruited, after final response 100 complete questionnaire were added.</p> <p>3. Corrected</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none">The manuscript is about awareness regarding heart attack and the title of the manuscript should be edited. In the title, it was just mentioned that the questionnaire is about heart awareness.The following sentence is mentioned in the manuscript: “the participant gave their consent, which stated that their information would be kept confidential and that they could skip any questions they did not want to answer”. This sentence should be changed. The participants do not give consent that their information would be kept confidential. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">CorrectedCorrected |
| Optional/General comments | - | |

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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |