

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78055
Title of the Manuscript:	Success of Immediate Manual Detorsion of Testicular Torsion
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: Para-2: Line-6: "reduced infertility" [please correct it as 'reduced fertility'] 2. Methods: Line-3: "accprding" [correct it as 'according'] 3. Methods: Last Line: "Only Saudi-based studies were included." [You have not strictly included only Saudi-based studies. Why is this sentence added? Moreover, you have not mentioned about number of articles selected for review; what are your search terms? What kind of review is being carried out?] 4. Discussion: Para -2 : Line-2: "For instance, a previous study" [Please provide reference number of this study] 5. Discussion: Para-2: Line-4: "another similar study" [Please provide reference number of this study] 6. Discussion: Para-5: "This has been attributed to inducing a remarkable relaxation of the cremasteric muscles, which will subsequently lead to improved effectiveness of detorsion and enhanced risk of developing potential complications." [Please check and correct the sentence; it can't be enhanced risk of developing potential complications"] 7. Discussion: Para-7: 'The rete of the testicular tissue reperfusion' [please correct rete as rate] 8. References: [There are duplicity in some of the references. Reference number 3 and 18 are same; reference numbers 8 and 16 are same; reference numbers 12 and 14 are same. Generally, once a reference number is assigned to an author the same number is used again and again in the text. So make necessary correction and delete the duplicate references and correct the numbers in the text properly] 9. Reference number 22 is incomplete. [Provide place and name of the publishers and other details necessary while quoting a textbook.] 10. Figure submitted is copied from another source (UpToDate). Using the image without permission amounts to copy right violation. So please provide proper permission to use the copy right image. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Discussion part is not cohesive.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>C.S. Ramesh Babu</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>C.C.S. University, India</i>