

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_96397
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of discharge diagnosis with initial clinical findings
Type of the Article	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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: Please describe the problem or lack of knowledge that address by this study. 2. Aim of the study: please added the aims or purposes of the research and its relationship with other studies in the field. 3. Methods: Please add the study methodology that use in this study in more details 4. The result; - should be presented with clarity and precision, 5. The conclusion should relate to the aim and problem that describe under introduction and aim. 6. The keywords are following the abstract, use about five to 10 key words do not mention in the title so please changes these words without any abbreviations. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction is ideally in structures of the following order: - This paragraph is very important because you should tell the editor or reviewer or reader, why you select this study. In the first section, you may brief introduce the main problem in this era, then some difficult problems remain to be resolved. The second section, you may introduce how many ways is undergoing and you may analysis these ways and try to find their deficiencies. Following the third section, you may propose your idea or hypothesis. At the last section, you may suggest some way which may resolve the issues. <p>Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The methods section should write in a way that everyone could repeat this study in the same manner. 2. How was the sample size of 2278 reached? 3. You should add study question, primary objectives and secondary objectives if available. 4. Patient selection: How were the patients selected, who selected the patients, on what criteria. How many patients exclude? Were patients prospectively enrolling or retrospectively assessed? 5. Who obtained the consent? How and when consent obtain from patients. 6. What outcome measures used? <p>Results</p> <p>This is very important as well. You may collect enough data and including control group and study group. The results should give reader some exciting positive messages which could strongly support your hypothesis</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be concise and only report RESULTS. 2. Results are meaningless without a better description in figures and tables. So please add this and provide a thorough analysis of these results. This is the core of the manuscript and the most valuable result. <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A discussion should offer a short overview of the results, and an in-depth discussion of the interpretation of them. 2. Do the authors have an explanation on why the results are different compared to other studies? <p>Limitations of the study: - You should add</p> <p>Conclusion:</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	is logic in manner and relevant. References: 1. Please use uniform references, when available with DOI. 2. Make sure update the old references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to be easy sentences	
Optional/General comments	the manuscript is certainly interesting, and the topic is very relevant. There are potentially very valuable lessons to learn from this manuscript. However, many issues need to address before the manuscript is suitable for publication. Overall: 1. There are many spelling errors in this manuscript. See guide for authors for a free grammar checker. E.g.....etc. 2. Every time a new abbreviation is used you should state the full name E.g. KSMC, ER Title: - "Emergency diagnosis VS discharge diagnosis; retrospective study." Is a brief phrase describing the contents of the paper.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adel Hamed Elbaih
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt