



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_49508
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the mental skills of physical examinations of children by nurses and related agents at Children's Medical Education Center in Rasht in 2018
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:

(<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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: please confirm, "shift work (443 / 0 = p),". 2. Country name should appear in abstract and the title. 3. Delete: "Nursing is a complex and difficult profession which leads to the promotion of physical, psychological and social health (1-2). Nurses as the main collectors of health centers, are the most important and largest group in the care system (3)." This is medical Journal and everybody knows this. Do not state "common knowledge". Shorten the paper volume. 4. Delete the explanation of "physical examination": the reason for this is the same as above. 5. Study population: Did all nurses in the corresponding wards number 140? To judge selection bias, state this. 6. State definitely 1) or 2). 1) You made some "novel" observations (for the first time observations), or, 2) You only reconfirmed preexisting data. If 1), what is new? State them in first, second, third manner. If 2), you must state this straightforwardly. Even if 2) was the case, describing the area-data is of some value. But stating 1) or 2) honestly is of paramount importance in scientific paper. 7. Reference is inconsistent. Some have "published date" while others not. 	
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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Shigeki Matsubara</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Jichi Medical University, Japan</i>