

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83618
Title of the Manuscript:	“SURGICAL APGAR SCORE: UTILITY IN PREDICTING POSTOPERATIVE OUTCOME IN CASES OF EXPLORATORY LAPAROTOMY”
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The inverted commas beginning and ending the title should be removed. 2. The place of study should be captured in the title. 3. The sentence structure (i.e., Tenses) should be looked at again, since this is not a proposal for academic presentation. 4. There was no in-text citations captured at the introduction. 5. You need to beef-up the content of the introduction to include studies done elsewhere vis-à-vis your problem statement. 6. The gender and age results could be combined and presented as one frequency table with the heading Sociodemographic data of respondents as Table 1. 7. Have hypertension, diabetes mellitus, cardiac disease and COPD all fall under one frequency table as Table 2 with the heading Client conditions or diseases (i.e., composite table). 8. If you did any cross-tabulation of the variables, please indicate it. 9. The discussion needs to be written. It is disjointed. Citations could not be traced when reading the introduction. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All legends or figures already having a frequency table should be deleted. 2. Frequency tables should be properly drawn to meet standards with their corresponding headings and numbered serially. 3. The entire referencing critically needs attention. 4. With the references, I suggest you abreast yourself with any of the major styles you are comfortable with and use it. But APA 7th edition would do. 	
Optional/General comments	I suggest you find samples of articles with results on variables that have been cross-tabulated to beef-up knowledge.	

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:	Richard Opoku Asare
Department, University & Country	College of Nursing, Ntotroso, Ghana