

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_76095
Title of the Manuscript:	Objective Evaluation of Efficacy of Decortication in Chronic Pleural Empyema in Adult Patients
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. There are numerous “Grammatical” mistakes. So, corrections and language editing are obligatory. (Major).</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. Regarding the “ Title ”; Please, What is the innovative issue of your article to be more differentiated from many other published articles? (Minor).</p> <p>2. Please, change the following sentence in the “Background” of the “Abstract ”; “The aim of this study was to evaluate objectively the efficacy of conventional decortication operation in chronic pleural empyema in adult patients.” to “This study aimed to objectively evaluate the efficacy of conventional decortication operation in chronic pleural empyema in adult patients”. (Minor).</p> <p>3. The “Methodology” of the “Abstract ” is a bad-written and non-targeted general description. There is a large defect in shortly clearing the “Methodology” of the article; type of study, time, duration, place, comparative method, and mode. Reconstruction of it is necessary. (Minor).</p> <p>4. Unfortunately, in “Patients and Methods” the author (s) had given more un-needed details regarding (Chest x-ray, Computed tomography, and Pulmonary function test). Please concise and summarize what will you need from these investigations. (Minor).</p> <p>5. Using of suggestion terms ” in the “ Conclusion ” such as “In conclusion, the improvement in the lung function, arterial blood gases, transverse and antero-posterior diameter of diseased and normal hemithorax was proposed to have resulted from the decortication in chronic empyema thoracis.” is misplaced and inappropriate. Using suggestion terms is the site of “Methods”. The “ Conclusion ” is a final summary of your research which does not need proposed terms. Please reconstruct it in the “ Conclusion ” and“ Conclusion ” of the “Abstract ” . (Minor).</p> <p>6. Number of “References” regarding an original article is a little. Increasing the number according to the Journal guidelines is needed. (Minor).</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yasser Mohammed Hassanain Elsayed
Department, University & Country	Egypt