

Review Form 1.6

Journal name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript number:	Ms_JPRI_86030
Manuscript Title:	ASSEMENT OF SEVERAL PROGNOSTIC FACTORS OF INTESTINAL ANASTOMATIC LEAKAGE
Article Type	

General guideline for the peer review process:

The peer review policy of this journal states that **the manuscript should** be rejected only on the basis of "**lack of novelty**", provided that the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To learn the full guideline for the Peer Review process, reviewers are asked to visit this link:

<https://www.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

PART 1 : Review comments

	Reviewer comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight this part in the manuscript. It is mandatory for authors to write their feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVIEW Comments	The Abstract needs to meet some highlighted points to become more complete, facilitating the search, as well as suggesting the inclusion of new keywords. The references, although pertinent and based on manuscripts, can be more up to date as only 31% are less than five years old.	
<u>Minor</u> REVIEW Comments	<p>The authors present a prospective study of surgical review in patients of a hospital unit. It is important and relevant to know the postoperative process not only in terms of quality of care, but also in terms of the social impact and quality of life of patients.</p> <p>The language is clear, objective, although it can detail a few more points as identified throughout the text with a view to qualifying the information. There is a need to correct the tense because some verbs are in the future tense and the work was done.</p> <p>The procedures are clear, but it is suggested to provide more information on the number of patients who did not adhere to the consent form and those who did not meet the inclusion criteria (or if patients were excluded). In this way it is possible for the reader to have an idea of the context and the problem.</p> <p>Regarding the presentation of the results, the question that remains for the reader is the reason for the two tables, as it can present in a reorganization a table grouping the description of the variables in subgroups and below the pre and post operative factors. As it will be self-explanatory, the table will quickly facilitate the identification of points. Another suggestion is how clusters can present a new understanding of which cluster has more impact than another. In this way new analyzes such as odds ratios are possible. Finally, since the number is 100 patients, it allows the use of rounding in the values, improving reading, it is suggested in the discussion to update references and relate to the context of community care. Finally, it is suggested that you identify which aspects in the last sentence of the conclusion can be identified and how to improve.</p>	
Optional/general 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?	<p><i>(If so, please write the ethical issues here in detail)</i></p> <p>Yes, and they are properly declared.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joao Carlos Alchieri
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil