

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81675
Title of the Manuscript:	Psychometric characteristics of PSS-10 in cardiovascular patients
Type of the Article	Original

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The long name of the scale should be written in the title.</li> <li>2. Brief information and data about other medical fields, for which the validity and reliability of the scale were previously made, should be given in the introduction. Information on whether it has been used before in cardiological patients should be given.</li> <li>3. In the introduction, it should be briefly explained which type of researchers the scale will appeal to and what kind of studies it can be used in.</li> <li>4. For the purpose of the study, it should be clearly stated which psychometric properties of the scale are discussed.</li> <li>5. How the sample size was calculated, power analysis findings should be added.</li> <li>6. More information should be given about the population constituting the sample. Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be given in detail. What is included in the definition of cardiovascular disease should be explained specifically for this group. It should be explained how many people belong to which disease group.</li> <li>7. It should be explained how the application was done, how many times the scales were given to the participants, who the evaluators were, and whether they were blind to the application.</li> <li>8. The methods used in statistical analysis should be given in detail.</li> <li>9. Results and Discussion sections should be separated.</li> <li>10. Comparisons should be made with previous scale applications in the discussion.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Language needs extensive editing	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Lut Tamam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cukurova University, Turkey</b>