

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83530
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF CLOSEST SPEAKING SPACE IN DIFFERENT ANGLE'S CLASSIFICATION
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.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	<div>1. The title is not clear and needs to be rephrased.</div> <div>2. Abstract needs to be structured properly according to the journal guidelines.</div> <div>3. Keywords must be according to MeSH words.</div> <div>4. Please remove figure and table in results in the abstract.</div> <div>5. Please write a clear and consolidated aim of the study at the end of introduction.</div> <div>6. Punctuation, and grammar needs to be checked again.</div> <div>7. Please expand the short forms the first time you mention it.</div> <div>8. Methodology must be explained in detail.</div> <div>9. Materials and Methods.</div> <div><div>• Should be in the following order (without subheadings):</div><div>• Start with the study design and type, mention the name and the time duration (specify in which month & year) the study was done.</div><div>• Institutional Ethics committee IEC number.</div><div>• Total sample size. Sample size estimation, Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria.</div><div>• Parameters studied. Data collection Statistical Analysis (subheading)</div></div> <div>10. The article is just about 1500 words, and it needs to be increased in content.</div> <div>11. Discussion is too brief.</div> <div>12. In discussion, please compare your study to previous studies.</div> <div>13. Write name of authors in the discussion.</div> <div>14. The conclusion should be written in brief. It should be a clear take home message based on the specific aim and findings of the study. Please modify.</div> <div>15. Kindly add a few limitations of the study under a separate heading titled "LIMITATIONS".</div> <div>16. Add more references.</div>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<div>This article is extremely poorly written and very short. The entire article needs to be rewritten with proper journal guidelines and needs a major English language revision to be accepted in this journal.</div>	

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?	<div>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</div>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Shammas
Department, University & Country	Ibn Sina National College for Medical Studies, Saudi Arabia