

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	I am not convinced as to this study's relative importance given its small sample size and how applicable it is to the clinic. It does however provide some objective evidence of what is already known/assumed clinically.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract is comprehensive, however its use of jargon and unfamiliar tools may hinder continued reading.	
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.	As a professional research article, the sections of the research article are appropriate.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	Yes	

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> No	
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.	No	
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)	No	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

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"

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7)	8

Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	
---	--