Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRNH_77774**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Granisetron versus Ondansetron for Prevention of Post-Operative Nausea and Vomiting (PONV) in Patients Undergoing Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy**
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:

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

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	1. **Grammatical errors and errors in sentence formation need to be corrected – eg granisetron spelling at many places** 2. 'Regarding complications there was no significant difference between efficacy of granisetron and ondansetronas no p-value is found to be ≤0.05.' – this statement gets repeated in the paper. Complication and efficacy are entirely different aspects of the study. Kindly clarify what you mean by the statement. 3. **'Conclusion:** Our study results showed that there is no significant PONV (p≤0.05.) was found.' – kindly explain the conclusion with respect to granisetron vs. ondansetron. **4. Of the 14 references, nearly 5 of them are more than 10 years old, newer references to be added.** **5. Were there any patients taken as controls? If any data is available regarding the same could be added, it would add weightage to the publication.**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Spell check and grammar check of the whole file needs to be done. 2. The errors in document are highlighted in red, please correct the same.	
Optional/General comments	1. Though the study is well structured, it provides no new data compared to already available world literature	

Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Anjali R***
Department, University & Country	***All India Institute Of Medical Science, India***