



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_41225
Title of the Manuscript:	A survey on the relationship between quality of life and happiness among children and adolescents under the supervision of welfare organization of Ahwaz in 2017
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Is the Welfare Organization the name of an Iranian institution? If yes, this expression must be written with the initials in capital letters. Replace, throughout the text, "welfare organization" with "Welfare Organization".</p> <p>1. Title</p> <p>The Title should contain a more scientific and concise language. Suggestion: "Relationship between quality of life and happiness in children and adolescents under the supervision of the Welfare Organization in Ahwaz, Iran."</p> <p>2. Abstract</p> <p>Line 14: Replace "Materials" with "Methodology".</p> <p>Line 15: Inform that the study design is cross-sectional. "This descriptive-analytical cross-sectional study was conducted on 75 children and adolescents..."</p> <p>Line 16: Remove the phrase "using available sampling method". Include information that children resided in Ahwaz orphanages for more than a year.</p> <p>Line 21: Replace "Findings" with "Results".</p> <p>Correct the style of the abstract, according to: http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/general-guideline-for-authors</p> <p>3. Introduction</p> <p>Lines 73, 74 e 75: The expression "In my opinion" refers to the opinion of whom? I suggest removing this expression from the text. The Vinhon study should be added in the references. Reference number 14 refers to the Seddiqi study.</p> <p>4. Material and methods</p> <p>Line 87: Replace "Methods" with "Material and methods"</p> <p>Line 90: Was the study conducted in 2015 or 2017? The objectives relate to the year 2015.</p> <p>What is the "Welfare Organization"? Is this a program or a government department? Or would it be a non-governmental organization? Is it a national or municipal organization? What are the objectives or purposes of this organization? What is the relationship of the Welfare Organization with orphanages? This information needs to be clear in the</p>	NOTED



methodology so that readers worldwide can understand the purpose of this study and the functions assigned to the Welfare Organization.

Has the study been approved by any ethics committee? Did the participants and their legal representatives sign the informed consent form? This information needs to be reported in the Methodology.

Please provide the minimum and maximum scores that can be obtained in each test (Kidscreen and Oxford happiness questionnaire), to facilitate the analysis of the results.

5. Results

Line 117: Replace "Findings" with "Results".

Cite Table 1 in the text.

The following information should also be presented in Tables: "Age did not show a significant correlation to happiness and quality of life ($P > 0.05$). Furthermore, boys and girls showed similar levels of happiness and life satisfaction ($P > 0.05$). The average happiness in all samples (44.97 ± 15.73) was in the range of (14-74), of which 45 (60%) reported happiness. Children and adolescents' mean quality of life (80.57 ± 8.92) showed range of changes (56-97)."

The score obtained does not need to be entered in parentheses. For example, on line 123 and 124, one should report "The average happiness in all samples (44.97 ± 15.73) was in the range of 14-74 points, of which 45 (60%) reported happiness." On line 126, one should report "The quality of life score was 17.49 ± 3.26 for physical health; 22.76 ± 2.26 for emotions and mood in general ..."

Remove the text between lines 132 and 134 (There was a statistically significant difference between those that reported happiness and those that did not in terms of physical and health activities ($P < 0.001$) and friends ($P = 0.002$)). This information is already on lines 129 to 132, so it is repeated.

The following information (line 135): "There was a direct and significant relationship between happiness and the school related category ($P < 0.001$ and $r = 0.371$)", contradicts the data in Table 2. Please check the information or present this data in another table.

In Table 2, happiness is classified as "yes" or "no." What is the required score on the happiness test, to determine if the person is happy or not? Inform this cut-off point in the Methodology.

Please remove the "t-test" column from Table 2. The asterisks should be noted in the "p-value" column.

What is the statistical analysis used in Table 2? T-test, Pearson's or Spearman's correlation coefficient, or chi-square test? In the text (lines 129 to 132) the authors report correlation analyzes. But Table 2 does not present correlation analysis. Please insert the table containing the correlation analyzes.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>6. Discussion</p> <p>The authors found that 40% of children and adolescents did not report happiness. What strategies and interventions can be proposed by the Welfare Organization to increase the quality of life and happiness of children in orphanages?</p> <p>7. Conclusion</p> <p>In addition to indicating the main conclusion of the study, the authors should provide an explanation on the importance and relevance of the reported study.</p> <p>8. References</p> <p>Correct the reference style, according to: http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/general-guideline-for-authors#SDI-reference-style</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The ideas expressed in the text are confusing and repetitive.</p> <p>The methodology does not provide adequate information to allow the experiment to be reproduced. Ethical aspects are not mentioned.</p> <p>The results are not clearly described concisely. Tables are not self-explanatory.</p> <p>The formatting of the text must follow what is recommended by the General Guideline for Authors, available at: http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/general-guideline-for-authors</p>	

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>