Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_78820**
Title of the Manuscript:	**THE EFFECT OF DIFFERENT GENRES OF MUSIC ON BLOOD PRESSURE AMONG DIFFERENT AGE GROUPS**
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	**- Divergence between title and objective related to age groups, I suggest that you remove it from the title or include it in the objective.** **-Material and method- The inclusion criterion reported was sample between 10 and 80 years old but this article just mention adolescents. I suggest to unify the criterion** **- Need further explanation about the questionnaire, example: Was there blood pressure checked before and after the music? Wich kind of hardware (Digital ? Manual ?) Vendor ? How was the method of pressure checking ? just berofe, during and just after the music ?** **- Result and discussion – Graphics with confusing explanations** **- Music has been reported to have an effect on the brain, how was this assessed?** **- It was reported that 89,11% have a history of blood pressure (of what? Increase or descrease ? This was not clear at all article.**	
Minor REVISION comments	The conclusion was that Fast musics ad dangerous and innefective. Witch variables bring you guys to this conclusion. That was not clear for me.	
Optional/General comments	Due the items commented above like Method of blood pressure check, Questionnaire answered without supervision of authors, between other, I understand that there is kind of bias in the article	

Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Aline Margioti Zanella**
Department, University & Country	**Aline Zanella Rehabilitation Clinic, Brazil**