

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123895
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT PROPOFOL PREPARATIONS ON INJECTION PAIN
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I liked the topic. Because just as it cared about the advantages of Propofol as the rapid onset of its effect, rapid recovery, easy titration, and reduction of postoperative nausea and vomiting are the reasons why it is frequently preferred. Concerned also about most disadvantages of it	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No its enough	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Because of this study suggests specific practice and highlights the significance of established procedures and different concentration of propofol and guidelines to guarantee the best possible patient outcomes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references need to be updated	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is good	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The general idea of the research topic is not bad, on the contrary it is new	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Noha Mohammed Ismael Awad El-Adl</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Cairo</b>