



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	Line 41: it is better to use the word patients instead of clients Line 51: provide references Line 58: provide references Line 89: provide references Line 97: provide references Line 137: it is better to use the word patients instead of clients Statistical Analysis: have You assessed the data distribution is Normal? If so the T student is fine, otherwise You should You non-parametric test. I would suggest to perform the Normality test in order to assess that and eventually to perform a non-parametric test. Line 294: and who were administrated. Line 295: those (control group=B) who received the routine non-standardised perioperative pain management. Not necessary. Write compared o the control group. Lines-296-297: the evidence is not given by the direct means comparison, but by the T-student test p values that compares directly the means. Line 305: that is not necessary I would put recommendation before conclusion and in Italics Line 358-359: have proven beyond reasonable doubt: isn't it too much? Please write just have proven or showed or demonstrated	Clients has been changed to patients in the manuscript [2] [3] [8] [10] Clients has been changed to patients in the manuscript Changes have been made Correction done Has been changed. Compared to the control group. Corrections done Deleted Changes done



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Changes have been made.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<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.