

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82703
Title of the Manuscript:	CAUSES AND RISK FACTORS OF COCCYDYNIA IN POSTPARTUM WOMEN IN DHQ SARGODHA
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Abstract:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ the objective of the study is repeated• Introduction:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Too long.○ There is no objective of the study: where's the question of your research.• Material & methods:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Too short○ Much of the information found in the "results" does not exist in this chapter○ self developed questionnaire:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Need more information about it: what are the Items, is it a validated questionnaire...○ "a convenient sampling technique was used":<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ What does it mean? I'm not sure you need "a sampling technique" as your research is an observational study.○ What's the delay between the PP and your study? You seem did it immediately after delivery: "the questionnaires were filled at the spot"○ What are the statistical tools?• Results:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Don't begin results by the statistical tool used○ Your results are mixed up○ No links between the text and the tables○ How did you evaluate the severity of pain"○ On table 3:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The number of NONE pregnancies among participants is 1: note that in MM you included only women in the post partum!!!▪ What is the difference between Normal delivery and C section○ The aim of your study is to find the causes and risk factors of coccydynia among your population: you only gave the causes. For the risk factors you have to make an univariate analysis and than a multivariate analysis.• Discussion:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Some results mentioned in your discussion, does not exist in the chapter "Results".• Conclusion:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Does not match well with the results of the manuscript• References:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Pay attention to the citation number: 1-3-16-17-18	Modified
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Avoid beginning sentences with numbers: write them in letters• In the chapter discussion, you don't discuss your results, you only report clinical studies• Some citations are very old: 1950-1959-1963-1983-1995...	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Take better care to the redaction of the manuscript• Some parts of the manuscript are confused• Chapters of the manuscript are not balanced	Noted

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>	