

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77758
Title of the Manuscript:	The role of ultrasound in diagnosis of acute appendicitis: A review article
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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>Sentences have grammatical mistakes. Some sentences are confusing.</p> <p>The author has mentioned that sensitivity and specificity in diagnosing AA in the United States have been found to range from 71 to 92 percent and 83 percent, respectively, for normal contrast-enhanced CT 98 and 91 percent. These figures of sensitivity and specificity are not as per the standard textbook (Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 19th edition, vol II, by Mc Graw Hill Education publication. As per this standard text, the effectiveness of Ultrasonography as a tool to diagnosis appendicitis is first of all highly operator dependent, secondly in very skilled hands the sensitivity is 86% and specificity is 81%. The sensitivity and specificity of computed tomography are 94% and 95% respectively.</p> <p>The author has not mentioned the concrete findings on ultrasonography suggesting the presence of appendicitis, i.e., wall thickening, increased appendiceal diameter and the presence of free fluid. The roll of ultrasound, especially intra vaginal techniques, which is most useful for identifying pelvic pathology in women has not been mentioned. Further, the roll of ultrasound for diagnosing appendicitis in pregnant patients has not been mentioned.</p> <p>The review article falls in the category of major revision. Articles may be returned to the author for carrying out necessary corrections/ amendments for further review.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Nil	
Optional/General comments	Ni	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kanwar Singh Goel</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>SGT University, India</i>