

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_100318
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Comparative Efficacy of Midazolam and Clonidine as Premedication Agents: Assessing Heart Rate Response and Anti-Sialogogue Effect in Patients Undergoing General Anesthesia
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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	Recent references should be added	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The authors mentioned that this present study aimed to compare the efficacy of oral premedication with midazolam and clonidine in patients undergoing general anesthesia for various surgeries. However, the discussion part is not related to this manuscript. <i>In the discussion part the authors mentioned as 'The present study aimed to analyze the distribution of age, gender, and ocular manifestations in rheumatologic disorders and their relationship with cataract types and steroid use'.</i></p> <p><i>It is not appropriate to review the article as it is. It would be more appropriate to evaluate the manuscript after adding the discussion section again correctly.</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dilek Altun</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Acibadem Mehmet Ali Aydınlar University, Turkey</b>