



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_68594
Title of the Manuscript:	A Prospective Study On Clinico-Radiological Correlation And Conservative Management Of Non-Traumatic Acute Abdomen At A Tertiary Care Centre
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The details as presented in the lower half of the introduction take the form of a review and has failed to introduce the problem being addressed by the study as per the title and the objectives. Align your introduction to the title and objectives, identify what the problem is so as to justify or demonstrate the need for the study. 2. The inclusion criteria has to include consenting so that those who decline to consent are excluded from the study. Additionally, make the criteria exhaustive 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use correct grammar in the sentence on introduction – There has been advancements in radiological diagnosis of acute,, to read – There have been advancements..... 2. Acronyms/abbreviation should be defined or given in full the first time it is used. 3. Correct the word appendicectomy to appendectomy 4. Complete the following sentence as it appears on the second paragraph of page 3 – A lot of other additionally present with symptoms resembling acute appendicitis. 5. The following sentence as it appears on paragraph 3 of page 3 is incomplete and does not make sense – Appendiceal and Postoperative Abscesses: Treatment 6. Check and correct paragraph three and four on page 3 for the wordings to flow and make sense. 	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consenting of the study participants has not been detailed and apparently the PI is not planning to consent the participants hence violating the applicable ethical principles 2. There should be a consent form attached to the protocol so as to be reviewed together and all patients to sign an informed consent before being enrolled to the study. 3. Respect for autonomy and confidentiality – The PI has not detailed how the two issues will be assured. Will there be any use of identifiers in the data to be generated? 4. The principle of beneficence/non-maleficence has not been taken care of – these are patients coming in for emergency attention, how is the observational study going to impact on the management of the patient? Is there any undue effect on the way the patients will be attended to by the medics? 5. Is the protocol going to be reviewed by an IRB? The study involves use of living human subjects and hence has to undergo a review not unless it is exempted in the home country. 6. Will there be any use of identifiers in the study? If yes, how are the identifiers going to be managed to assure confidentiality? 7. How will the study findings going to be disseminated? How will they be made available to benefit the people/general population? 8. I could not ascertain the qualification of the PI and the co PIs to be able to assess his suitability to undertake the proposed study. 	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Erick Mibei
Department, University & Country	University of Kabianga, Kenya