

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79563
Title of the Manuscript:	A study to assess the effect of an IB (information bundle) on Physiological parameters among patients undergoing upper GI endoscopy
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.journalprij.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>- SUMMARY: Background: I miss the introduction of the main article subject: the importance of the information bundle on Physiological parameters, so that the importance of the objective can be understood. Method: explains only the number of patients and not the methodology Findings: I suggest changing the name for "results and discussion" and putting which parameters had such statistical difference.</p> <p>- INTRODUCTION: explains what endoscopy is, but not the main scope of the work, which is information bundle on Physiological parameters and the importance of this. I suggest removing the summary of the literature and incorporating this text into the introduction section. In the third and fourth paragraph of the "Summary of the literature" there is an excess of the word <i>anxiety</i>, which could be rewritten to avoid repetition.</p> <p>- METHODOLOGY: I missed the inclusion and exclusion criteria, such as the reason for the sample size (sample calculation performed? Convenience sample within a stipulated period? Any age? Any gender? Patients who underwent the exam for the first time or repeated? Diagnostic or therapeutic upper digestive endoscopies?). Other information should also be included, such as the date of collection, hospital, cross-sectional study or cohort, whether it was passed through the institution's ethics committee and possibly the process number. I suggest removing the "Procedure" section and clarifying the points mentioned above. In the Implementation of Information Bundle, it would be interesting to describe who the person providing face-to-face explanations is: secretary, nurse, endoscopist, medical student, and if this person was trained to answer patients' questions. The methodology lacks explaining how the statistical analysis of the data will be carried out. I suggest putting the questionnaire used as an attachment. Medications used and previous diseases were included (hypertensive patients, patients with asthma, etc)?</p> <p>- DATA ANALYSIS: Section I: the gender distribution of patients is missing, in addition to the mean and standard deviation of the patients age. It refers to the arterial pressure of the patients, but it is not clear whether the classification of hypertension was performed according to what was previously reported by the patients (were the included patients known to have hypertension or not?). Likewise, if the patients have not blood hypertension, but had high blood pressure during medication, they cannot be classified as hypertensive. If you choose to keep the classification of hypertension in previously hypertensive patients, I suggest placing the guideline used to classify the stages. Table 5 provides information that could have been used in the demographic data session. Explaining the reason for choosing age groups, this fact can represent a bias. There is a need to improve the discussion by placing other studies and evaluating/explaining all the parameters used and found. In the last paragraph of the Conclusion section, for example, it explains the decrease in saturation and heart rate, but as this is an expected process during sedation and the endoscopic procedure, what was the sedation used for example? The study used to discuss this (8) was carried out in patients undergoing upper gastrointestinal endoscopy with heart problems.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- METHODOLOGY: I suggest renaming it "Material and methods"</li> <li>- OBJECTIVES: I suggest writing in text form and not numerically what the main objective and secondary objectives are. Remove the hypothesis, or relocate it to the text, next to aim.</li> </ul>	

## Review Form 1.6

	<p>- STUDY DESIGN: I suggest structurat it in text form, not short sentences.</p> <p>- DATA ANALYSIS: suggest renaming it "Results &amp; Discussion". In tables 4 and 5, I suggest remove the last column (Significant at 0.05 level). It is be possible to join tables 5 and 6.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>In the "RECOMMENDATIONS" and "CONCLUSION" section, the important role of nurses in endoscopy is mentioned, but this is not mentioned in any other part of the paper.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Leticia Rosevics</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Federal do Paraná, Brazil</b>