

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JPRI_79380   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | DURATION OF POSTOPERATIVE ANALGESIA WITH INTRAVENOUS NALBUPHINE VERSUS INTRAVENOUS BUTORPHANOL IN PATIENTS UNDERGOING SHORT SURGICAL PROCEDURES UNDER TIVA. |
| 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:

<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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Sample size calculation not mentioned</li> <li>2- No statistical analysis paragraph about the type of variables (continuous and categorical variables and its representation) and tests used in this study</li> <li>3- <b>In methodology</b>, the strategy for continuing TIVA throughout the whole surgical procedure has not been clarified i.e maintenance dose or top up doses of propofol (only induction dose mentioned), also timing of hemodynamic monitoring during the surgery, as well as timing of assessing sedation score after the surgery need to be specify</li> <li>4- <b>In result</b>: the patient characteristic data not mentioned in table and not compared statistically between two groups to assess homogeneity of sample selected<br/>Also, no statistical comment on the difference between the two group regarding the sedation score only you mention values without referring to test used nor if there is a significant difference or not between group</li> <li>5- The subtitle (observation) has no role in the study and should be replaced by (RESULT) according to the standard scientific research writing items and all the result mentioned within this subtitle and no need to repeat the full data in discussion later only just give a hint about what you will discuss to avoid duplicate the information</li> <li>6- <b>In discussion</b>: the last three paragraphs discuss the hemodynamic effect of nalpuphine in other studies while you did not statistically study this hemodynamics in your research and did not reveal the study drugs effect on this variable and it was not from your objectives in this research in order to compare it with other studies.</li> <li>7- <b>References</b>: please write the reference uniformly according to the journal strategy.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- references no (9,10,11,12,13,14,15) need to be completed as no year, volume nor pages of the article mentioned</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>      | <p>In the introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The second, and the last two paragraphs have no references</li> <li>2- Ref (5) is incorrectly positioned</li> <li>3- The sixth paragraph (Many analgesics are used in premedication but the post operative analgesia is) it is better to be removed as the next paragraphs will give the same meanings</li> <li>4- Aim and objectives should be removed as they will be mentioned later in the right context in the research</li> </ol> <p>In methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Use the already recognized medical abbreviations (inj...?)injectable, it is just sufficient to be mentioned as I.V</li> <li>2- Inclusion and exclusion criteria better to be written in a continuous paragraph rather than in numbering form(and patient acceptance should be firstly mentioned before the others and the same for exclusion ;patient refusal)</li> </ol>   |   |

**Review Form 1.6**

|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments | The research should be revised according to the grammatical rules |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|---|--|--|
| <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>Shereen E Abd Ellatif</b>     |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Zagazig University, Egypt</b> |