

PART 1: Article Title:

	Editor's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	The article does have some importance as an exploratory piece that spurs more questions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	The title is explanatory and appropriate	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract is appropriate	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	.I believe the researcher does a good job in delineating the weakness associated with the project (related to sampling, and assessment tools used). However, the article does provide impetus for better controlled and larger studies.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	The references are appropriate	

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i>	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	I do not think it is plagiarized	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	I think the disclaimer is important. The author used the Xcite stimulator which many may not be familiar with however the use without explanation, description or alternative may lead to the reader thinking that the researcher has some benefit to using this particular device.	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

<p>Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"</p> <p>I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.</p>
--

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9)	8

Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	
---	--