

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice</a>                  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJMPCP_100923   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Use of ketamine for sedation and analgesia in the emergency department : Systematic review |
| Type of the Article      | Review 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.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, but need to be more extensive.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Yes</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>The manuscript need major revision: The title is inappropriate.<br/>The manuscript not systematic review, but rather is original article that should be rewritten.<br/>The title should be changes as well as the whole concept of the manuscript.<br/>The main characteristic of ketamin is well defined as well as its usage at ED.<br/>The authors do not explain something new but the topic is still emerge.<br/>Therefore, I suggest to change the concept of the manuscript and add systemic review of the other literature.<br/>If the authors want to keep current format of the manuscript, it should be extensively corrected. The citation in the texts is missing, the hypothesis, the ethical principles.<br/>The ethical approval is missing. The tables should be rewritten.<br/>The conclusion is too long.<br/>The manuscript need extensive language editing.</p> |  |

**PART 2:**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                      |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Vlatka Sotosek</b>                |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Rijeka, Croatia</b> |