

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82565
Title of the Manuscript:	The Comparison of the effect of Olanzapine and Haloperidol and quetiapine on the resolution of individual delirium symptoms in ICU patients: a double-blind, clinical trial study
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.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>There are some differences between the doses described in the abstract and those listed in the materials and methods. I highlighted it in yellow in the manuscript.</p> <p>In materials and methods, the days of measurement are not clarified. Nor the reason for the extension of study time (15 days).</p> <p>In the discussions, the authors maintain that olanzapine has the same effect as haloperidol in terms of treating delirium, but in the conclusions they maintain that atypical antipsychotics are better than typical antipsychotics in this regard, it is not clear. I highlighted it in yellow in the manuscript.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The name of The Richmond Agitation Sedation Scale is spelled differently in two places. I highlighted it in green. I suggest putting the name once and then just the initials.</p> <p>In the second figure, the abscissa axis is confusing, because it says time and the numbers 1 2 3 4 appear. The days should be there, as in figure 1</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The general idea of the work is good, but I recommend for future research, more measurement time and not just 15 days.</p>	

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 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gerardo Abraham Fridman
Department, University & Country	School of Pharmacy, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina