



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47933
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Psychometric Assessment of the Need Assessment Tool for Women with the Experience of Pregnancy Termination due to Fetal Anomalys
Type of the Article	Study Protocols

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	The theme dealt here is important. I have some advices. 1. Title is wrong. "anomalys" should be "anomalies". 2. This is a "study protocol". Write so in the abstract. You here and there used "past tense" and at the same time "future tense": this may cause troubles. 3. You state in Discussion, "Although the psychological impacts of pregnancy termination due to fetal anomaly has been studied before but the specific needs and the required support for this population has not yet fully determined." You also state in Introduction that such study has not yet been performed in "Iran". Then, in other countries other than Iran, such kind of study has been already performed: the context indicates so. Then, please cite some references. Please write whether you will make (have made) some contrivance that is "Iran specific".	1-We revised this item in the text. 2- We revised this item in the text. 3- We revised these items in the text and cited some references.
Minor REVISION comments		-
Optional/General comments		-

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)	We revised this item in the text.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>