

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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study has significant merit to the healthcare providers in that it evaluates the comparative efficacy of 2 important drugs used in surgery 2. The title is suitable for the study. 3. The abstract is comprehensive enough in as far as scientific soundness of research is concerned. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well written. 5. The way the manuscript has been written is scientifically sound. 6. The references are up to date. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The author is fluent in the English language and therefor is suitable for scholarly communication.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	In my opinion as a reviewer, the research is innovative and I recommend that it should be accepted for publication. And the results should be disseminated for it contributes to new knowledge of science.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lucky Norah Katende Kyenda
Department, University & Country	Walter Sisulu University, South Africa