

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82709
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of sociodemographic correlates on quality of life of heart failure patients
Type of the Article	Original article (cross-sectional study)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Dear author, After critical evaluation the paper is quite interesting and valuable for this journal, however, it needs some needful corrections (minor/major) which are follows for the potential acceptance:</p> <p>1. Authors have to do a thorough grammar and spelling check. There are many grammatical errors in the manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>2. Abstract section is a synopsis of presented data and the information and specifically on the number of samples is not clear (consider to review this part also in the M&M section).</p> <p>3. Please avoid the abbreviation (i.e. "Qol") in the Abstract section appear for the first time. It will be in full form (i.e. "quality of life").</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>4. I hope that novelty and impact of this study need to be better emphasized in the introduction part.</p> <p>Materials and methods:</p> <p>5. Author are encouraged to arrange the materials and methods section in appropriate way that covers all the necessary headings such as;</p> <p>Study design (area) and duration. Study population and size. Sample collection technique and selection criteria (inclusion and exclusion) etc.</p> <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <p>6. The results are not well presented in the text. The authors are encouraged to give some finishing touches and elaborate the results in a deliberate way if possible.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>It's already there.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>All info present under materials and methods.</p> <p>Done</p>

Review Form 1.6

	<p>7. Discussion part is not clear and sound more like the presentation of the results rather than an actual discussion. It is recommended that the author increase some discussion space. The close-up hopes to see the critical comparison between this research and other similar recent researches in the literature. It would enrich the results.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>8. The content of the conclusion part is too small. Author should need to incorporate some supportive lines (paragraph) of the study in the conclusion section.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>9. Reference #1 and Reference # 11 is same. Kindly remove one of them and avoid duplication. Also overview the references section and follow an appropriate journal format for all the references.</p>	<p>Not much similar studies evident in the literature.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	