

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_69487
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness, practice, knowledge and attitude toward the covid 19 among antenatal patients at tertiary care Hospital
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<p>Page- 1 Introduction: virus is no more a "novel corona virus". It has specific name SARS-COV-2. (Line-1) change the part "non-availability of treatment" to "limited treatment options". (Line-2). Because now dexamethasone is a drug which reduced mortality in severe COVID-19, so this line needs modification.</p> <p>Methodology : This part is not clear.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How the author/s labelled subjects responses as "good", "unsatisfactory", "poor"- as written in discussion section? In discussion part they mentioned about using "knowledge score" to categorize subjects responses- if so , why this has not been mentioned in the methodology? There are well recognized knowledge scoring system for dichotomous answering (yes / no) questions. <p>Result section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> An interesting observation: they had 173 subjects all aged 28 to 37 years over 6 month period. Is it logical? In Indian subcontinent majority women give birth at early age and they got no women between 18 to 27 years over 6 month for ANC care in that institution??!! How it is possible? Mean age 29.34 ± 23.12 ; why SD was so high? explain 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Hena Rani Barua</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Rangamati Medical College, Bangladesh</i>