

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80864
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on reducing discharge turnaround time of IPD patients at AVBRH.
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.journalipri.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	<p>It is a very interesting topic for potential readers of this publication. Some minor comments are made in order to improve the current version of the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .- Title. Consider changing the title for another one that summarizes the objective of this study. The meaning of acronyms should be specified (IPD and AVBRH). .- Keywords. "Hospital" is a general word. Is it possible to consider another word? .- Abstract. Where it says "expected results" it should be put "results" .- Introduction. It is so large. Four pages is too much. The introduction should not be more than one page. .- Methodology: It is so short. Where it says "study will ve carrie out" it should be say "study was carried out". <p>It would be necessary to redefine a better methodology with for example, stdy inclusion dates, complete patient information, etc.</p> <p>Some doubts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .- The study has been approved by an ethics committee? .- Why were 60 patients included and not 50, 70 or 80? .- Was a sample calculation carried out for the study to be valid? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .- Results. The results are not results. It is only one paragraph where opinions are expressed. .- Discussion. The results of this manuscript are not compared with the results of other published studies. Only one paragraph referring to more than 20 articles [(8-12) and (17-30)]. <p>Limitations and Scope. Very telegraphic text, concise and unspecific. It's not easy to understand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .- Conclusion. It's short, too general and unspecific conclusion. .- Bibliography. Some citations are presented as "three authors et al"; in other ones as "six authors". In some references dates appear, in other ones do not appear. The year of publication in some references appears at the beginning, in others at the end. Review all references as well as author publication guide. <p>The inclusion of references 18 to 30 is not understood. They cover very varied topics different from the objective of this study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Comments to Editor: .- Please, read the comments to the authors. .- Currently, it does not present sufficient quality to consider its possible publication. .- Perhaps in a new version of the manuscript it could be oriented as a Scientific Letter.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Belén Alonso Ortiz
Department, University & Country	H. Universitario de Gran Canaria Doctor Negrín. Las Palmas de G. Canaria (Las Palmas), Spain