

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_95351
Title of the Manuscript:	Ultrasound PECS 2 versus Dexmedetomidine Infusion for Pain Management after Radical Mastectomy
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	It is a study, designed as a prospective randomised trial, as such it is interesting even if not new. yes yes yes yes yes yes Please, in the statistical section, change, though partially correct, qualitative with categorical; quantitative with continuous. Though the study is not inherently blinded, this should be clearly stated in the Materials and Methods.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, nevertheless some sections would be better if carefully edited.	
Optional/General comments	Each study has "limitations"; these should be reported at the end of the manuscript. This version does not mention any of them. Please, integrate and conform the paper like that.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alessandro Borgognone
Department, University & Country	S. Eugenio Hospital, Italy