

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76500
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESS THE KNOWLEDGE REGARDING SELECTED NON-PHARMACOLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN
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	i) There is nothing on sample size determination and any assumptions thereof. For the structured questionnaire composed of 30 multiple-choice questions, the sample size of 50 people seems too small. ii) The article lacks discussion section. iii) The results are not sufficient to draw this conclusion----"The awareness of non-pharmacological therapies among pregnant women was insufficient. It is essential to arrange community-based gatherings to educate pregnant women about non-pharmacological interventions". iv) The questions in the questionnaire should be listed. v) How were the participants selected? There is no sufficient basis for selection, which is likely to cause bias in the investigation.	
Minor REVISION comments	i) The introduction section and the need of study section should be combined and be broken into shorter bits. ii) The research results should describe the relationship between age, education, occupation or location and cognition in detail. Table 2 is too simple to reflect the relationship between factors. iii) More references in recent years should be cited.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yi Zhao
Department, University & Country	Zhejiang University, China