



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_53723
Title of the Manuscript:	Olfactory function following septorhinoplasty in Iranian population: using Rapid Smell Test (RST) as a fast
Type of the Article	Original 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	<p>In this study, the authors propose a Persian smell identification test (in adaptation to an American validated version), as well as an rapis smell test (5 odors). These tools were tested in 74 patients submitted to rhinoseptoplasty before and after surgery. I understand the it would be best to have 2 different publications, one the validation of the Persion adaptation of the smell identification test, and as second the investigation in patients submitted to nasal surgery.</p> <p>For validation, the process should be exposed in validation and revalidation to confirm its validation (the standard protocol for a validation process).</p> <p>As the investigation I suggest to include a flowchart of the patients (how many invited, how many excluded due to which criteria as you listed many, and finally how many included)</p> <p>Nasal surgery can be performed in different techniques, please dine which echnique used for septum surgery (Killian? Cottle/ other?), inffiltration with physiologic solution? Vasoconstriction?), all rhinoplasty with lateral fracture?)</p> <p>All patients performed rhinoseptoplasty or some just septoplasty?</p> <p>Why did you set the cut off point of PSIT at 17.5? Explain.</p> <p>SMT: how many smells and which were tested?</p> <p>Tables need to have the abreviations below the table.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> The study was submitted to the local etic committee.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Silke Weber
Department, University & Country	Sao Paulo State University, Brazil