

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80188
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A comparative evaluation of Intra-articular Bupivacaine vs Bupivacaine and Dexmedetomidine for postoperative analgesia in arthroscopic knee surgeries: A Study Protocol</b>
Type of the 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>)

### **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>This study protocol was made on the grounds that knee arthroscopic surgeries are done very commonly across the globe in recent times, but causes excessive post operative pain to the patient, so providing adequate post surgery pain relief is of utmost importance to promote early rehabilitation and discharge. The use of dexmedetomidine intra-articularly either as a solo drug or in a combination with other drugs decreases the pain associated with arthroscopic surgeries. Dexmedetomidine targets nociceptive receptors that are located in the periphery and hence the usage of dexmedetomidine as an adjuvant to Bupivacaine administered to the patient when the surgery ends would be an alternative and provide adequate analgesia. The aim of this study protocol is to compare Intra-articular Bupivacaine vs Bupivacaine and Dexmedetomidine for prolonging post operative analgesia following knee arthroscopy surgery.</p> <p>The manuscript is well written, but there are several typos and grammatical errors in it.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is well written, but there are several typos and grammatical errors in it.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>Young-Chang Arai</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Aichi medical university, Japan</b>