

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82506
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF INTRATHECAL DEXMEDTOMIDINE 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> 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"> <li>1. Objective: place the explicit purpose of the review.</li> <li>2. Sources of data: here you will report on the sources of information consulted.</li> <li>Selection of the studies: criteria used to select the studies.</li> <li>4. Synthesis of data: present the qualitative and quantitative results.</li> <li>5. Conclusions:</li> </ol> <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"> <li>1. Initial page</li> <li>2. Abstract</li> <li>3. Material and methods</li> <li>4. Characteristics of the articles included in the review: design of the study population.</li> <li>5. Selection of the articles reviewed: type of literature (national or international), language, search system.</li> <li>6. Synthesis</li> <li>7. Qualitative: investigates differences such as: type of population studied, treatment variants, success or failure criteria.</li> <li>8. Quantitative: conversion of data from the different studies to a common factor.</li> </ol>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>In the case of meta-analyses, Odds ratios or relative risk and confidence intervals of &gt;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>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zahaid Rodriguez Torres</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Guadalajara University, Mexico</b>