

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86414
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of postoperative complications with anemic women underwent gynecologic and obstetric surgeries
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The title and the objective are not inline• The introduction is not focused to the topic/objective• What is known and what is not known about the issue is not explicitly addressed• The gap of the previous study is not revealed• Justification and significant of the study should be clearly indicated Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why not you didn’t use probabilistic sampling technique• Show as the sample size calculation to come up with a total of 200 women were chosen for this study wherein 89 women were anemic and 111 were non-anemic• study design, population, sampling technique, inclusion and exclusion criteria, data collection tool and procedures, ethical consideration are not structurally and explicitly presented• what are your dependent and independent variables Result <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advanced analysis beyond chi square is needed like regression to assess the association between variables Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion will be changed after further analysis is done• Clinical implication and justification of the result need to be addressed	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Thou the area of the study is interesting it is not well organized and not well done. As a result, each section of the manuscript needs major revision	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	