

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78108
Title of the Manuscript:	Early mobilization is the key towards early functional independence in patient undergone Aortic valve replacement: A case study
Type of the Article	Case study

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>)

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 present study is interesting, original but there still should be some suggestions to the authors to increase its scientific value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract or key words: Need to add some key words. - Introduction: needs more detail about functional status. - No rough description of the significance of the study "importance of early mobilization on functional status. - No details on methodology about research hypothesis, procedure, tools (description, items, scoring system of New York Heart Association Functional Classification grade, Spirometric measurement, Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ). - Results: very good description of case, brief, concise, on point and clarified by diagram. - Reference: very limited reference, need more reference based on evidence based. - There is minimal S.M. - 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Please revise some other minor editing errors mentioned in the manuscript regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Procedure of research. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add recommendation based on result. 	

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:	Lamia Mohamed-Nabil Ismail
Department, University & Country	Cairo University, Egypt