

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77130
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF KETAMINE NEBULISATION WITH KETAMINE GARGLE IN ATTENUATING POST OPERATIVE SORE THROAT FOLLOWING GENERAL ANAESTHESIA WITH ENDOTRACHEAL INTUBATION
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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors present a prospective study comparing nebulized versus gargled ketamine before an intervention on the post-operative sore throat. The prospective study is well conduct, with two balanced group. The study is interesting, and the results seems to be here. However, the manuscript is not yet ready to publish as the method is much too poor. The drafting seems incomplete. I think that the authors have done the hardest part with the study setup, they should only push a bit more on manuscript edition to make this work pleasant to readership.</p> <p>Here are my main comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The ethical statement is unclear. Do you have a clinical trial number? How patients were informed? 2) There is no statistical method described! Please describe the type of test, hypotheses, sample size estimation, significance level chosen. This is mandatory. 3) The comment above is even more important as I see that durations in table 1 are shown as mean and standard deviation, suggesting a t-test, yet durations are exclusively positive thus often log-normal distributed. Here the p-value should come from a non-parametric test and authors should indicate whether they chose a one- or two-tailed approach. 4) The method section should be rewritten avoiding bullet points. 5) In the table 1, "Sex(F:M)" should be shown as (female n(%)), were female is chosen because they are in majority in the cohort. 6) Table 2: because you follow your patients at different hours, this should be shown as a 2-ways ANOVA (or a non-parametric equivalent for categorical scores) analysis for paired samples. A plot would be much clearer and the readership could appreciate trend over time. 7) Table 2: We cannot evaluate the statistical method hence trust the p-values (despite being far away from the significance threshold). 8) The conclusion at the end is not a paragraph, please write a well composed paragraph. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All over the text there are several spaces missing between words or capital letters in the middle of a sentence, possible a 'copy-paste' issue? - In the abstract, instead of "either sex", maybe you should provide the proportion of men/women? - 'receivde' instead of received - In abstract "scheduled for elective surgery under general" is too vague and no exclusion/inclusion criteria help to quickly grasp the type of intervention. - "Ketamine nebulisation is abetter alternative to ketamine gargle for reliving Post Operative sore throat." This conclusion is a bit 'raw'. - As you said that no 'Severe sore throat' were found, you should remove the row in the table 2. 	

Comment [N1]: What type of surgery

Comment [N2]: Cool, less ketamine, better thinking

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The study and setup are good, authors should really improve the drafting of the text and clarify the method. As it is I reluctantly read the text in the manuscript, I still find the result interesting!	
----------------------------------	---	--

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> A priori no, but the ethical statement is incomplete. Hence complementary items have to be presented for publication.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cartailler Jerome
Department, University & Country	France