

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81294
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on Surgical Management of Esophageal Rupture Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Review

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The authors have discussed an interesting subject in their review article. However, the aim of the study is not discussed in the manuscript. The introduction is too long and needs to be made shorter. There are numerous repetitions regarding causes; the list should be summarized into one paragraph. Authors are encouraged to provide a table to compare Non-surgical and surgical management. The verbs in scientific writing should not be stated at the end of sentences. The use of passive voice is observed in a large number in the manuscript. Overall, a major revision needs to be conducted in the English writing, references, and manuscript structure.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The semicolon usage is incorrect in the abstract "It can occur in three different anatomical..."</li> <li>2) There is inconsistent spacing in the manuscript between the sentences.</li> <li>3) The first sentence in the introduction about Boerhaave is ambiguous. The sentence may mean he had described the first occurrence of the rupture in all humans.</li> <li>4) please provide exact references for the mortality rates.</li> <li>4) "Instruments such as endoscope causes an elevation in the wall tension, particularly iatrogenic interventions, or a massive rise in intraluminal pressure caused by throwing up, chest injury, or abdominal injuries are the main stressors." This sentence should be written more professionally.</li> <li>5) There verb "lose" needs to be changed to loss in the "lead to lose of the connective tissue".</li> <li>6) Overall, the referencing method used in the manuscript is not correct. Authors need to provide exact references for the sentences they have written.</li> <li>7) "Primary tear repair is reported to be the best option when esophageal rupture is diagnosed early (within 24 hours of rupture), while the best management for the rupture is it diagnosis was delayed for more than 24 hours is still under debate." The second part is not clear.</li> <li>8) Sentences before "management" section need full stops.</li> <li>9) References for "management" section should be revised.</li> <li>10) "Causes are different but could be classified..." this sentence should be edited, preferably with a colon.</li> <li>11) Why the nonconservative surgery is not discussed in the review?</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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:	Mehran Rahimi
Department, University & Country	Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Iran