

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82506
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF INTRATHECAL DEXMEDITOMIDINE AS AN ADJUVANT FOR CESAREAN SECTION - REVIEW ARTICLE
Type of the Article	Minireview 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	<p>In order for your summary to be better structured, I suggest you place it in the following order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Objective: place the explicit purpose of the review.2. Sources of data: here you will report on the sources of information consulted.Selection of the studies: criteria used to select the studies.4. Synthesis of data: present the qualitative and quantitative results.5. Conclusions: <p>According to the basic content of the meta-analysis, I suggest you to give a proper order to your research, in this case I suggest you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Initial page2. Abstract3. Material and methods4. Characteristics of the articles included in the review: design of the study population.5. Selection of the articles reviewed: type of literature (national or international), language, search system.6. Synthesis7. Qualitative: investigates differences such as: type of population studied, treatment variants, success or failure criteria.8. Quantitative: conversion of data from the different studies to a common factor.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In the case of meta-analyses, Odds ratios or relative risk and confidence intervals of >95% should be presented. It is important to comment on noteworthy aspects of some studies, for example "in a double-blind experimental study a significant difference may have been found between patients treated and not treated with a drug.</p> <p>The inclusion and exclusion criteria seemed correct to me, however I suggest you add the type of literature used (national or international), type of population used.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zahaid Rodriguez Torres
Department, University & Country	Guadalajara University, Mexico