



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_25018
Title of the Manuscript:	The role of intraoperative pain assessment tool in improving the management of postoperative pain
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	Best if you can also include the detailed (picture/table) of the used scoring systems. Also would be best if you can give timeline (figures) of what you did during the study. On results section, please omit the majority sentences. Readers can easily conclude from the description. I suggest to change paragraphs from line 194 to 248 into a table of distribution, and explain in some sentences only, Please make a sum or total number of participants of each group in Table 1. From eyeballing, it seems like the distribution of Group A and B are not equal. Table 2 and 3: Patient identity, please change to Group. Mean and Standard deviation in 1 table into Mean $\pm$ SD. 0.00 is <0.001 Table 2 and 3 in landscape paper (too crowded for portrait paper).	The pain score sheet has been provided The majority sentences has been removed Changes have been made The sum or total have been provided Patient Identity has been changed to Group



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I wonder why Fentanyl as pre-emptive analgesia was given only in study group? Line 180 : Ramsay, NOT Ramsey Tables: inconsistency N or count? Table 1:Pain intensity: capital or no capital?	Because pain was consciously assessed and monitored using pain scales which was not done for the control group. The correction has been done. All has been changed to N
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		The authors of this manuscript wish to thank the editor and the reviewer of this manuscript for their effort to ensure perfection of this manuscript. The points raised by the reviewer are valid and very important for this manuscript. Attempt has been made by the authors to correct all the points that were raised by the reviewer.