Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_79077**
Title of the Manuscript:	**MORPHOLOGICAL RESEARCH OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PERIOPERATIVE LOCAL USE OF ANESTHETICS AND ANTISEPTICS IN PATIENTS WITH PURULENT-NECROTIC LESIONS OF LOWER EXTREMITIES IN DIABETES MELLITUS**
Type of the Article	**Short 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	**Comments on title / abstract/ references** The title was wisely chosen to match with the aim of study and results. The research title is new and not pre-tracked. The abstract was writing carefully and abstract of the method of work and results was presented in a distinctive way. References are different and new, the research supported by references. **Comments on key words and introduction** The key words in the research match with all study. The introduction was short and clear to the reader, and there is a full explanation of the research and supported by references. The introduction was very well written and gave sufficient explanation to the research and included various references. **Comments on Material and method** The process of method is very clear. A brief and complete explanation of the method of work for research. A clear way to work for the reader. **Comments on results** The explanation of the results was good and it is clear about statistically significant result. Results are clearly and accurately arranged for the reader and divided in an excellent way and very clearly. Figure are very clearly and accurately for the reader. **Comments on discussion and conclusions** The discussion was wide ranging that contained all research results. The discussion was completely identical to the references and contains a full explanation of the results. The discussion were adequately supported in terms of references. The conclusion is written in a qualified manner and the conclusion answer the results in the research. **My comments** The research topic is new, as well as coherent, between the introduction, method of work, results and discussion it was written in a clear manner and supported by modern references, I see it is very excellent research for publication	
Minor REVISION comments	I have no minor notes	
Optional/General comments	I have no optional notes	

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)*	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed Chyad Abbas AL-Barqaawee
Department, University & Country	The Norwegian Directorate of Health in Oslo, Norway