



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56404

Title: Integrated Anaesthesia and Physiotherapy Strategies to Reduce Post-Thoracotomy Pulmonary Complications

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ **Accept after minor revision.....**
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- The manuscript addresses a highly relevant clinical challenge post-thoracotomy pulmonary complications by emphasizing a multidisciplinary, integrated perioperative approach.
- The review synthesizes current evidence from multiple studies, including randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, and systematic reviews, enhancing its comprehensiveness.
- The inclusion of emerging technologies such as digital health platforms and AI-based models demonstrates innovation and future-oriented insight.
- Clear delineation of the perioperative phases and the corresponding strategies adds to practical applicability.
- The emphasis on combining anesthetic and physiotherapy strategies within ERATS pathways supports multidisciplinary collaboration and holistic patient care.

Weaknesses of the Study

- As a narrative review, the criteria for selecting the referenced articles are not explicitly detailed, raising questions about potential selection bias.
- The manuscript lacks detailed methodological descriptions, such as structured search strategies, inclusion/exclusion criteria, or assessment of evidence quality.
- Specific data on the magnitude of intervention effects are limited; many claims are based on summarized evidence without detailed statistical analysis.
- There is minimal discussion about potential limitations or heterogeneity within the included studies.
- The article does not specify whether ethical approval was obtained or necessary, nor does it address patient consent considerations in the reviewed evidence.
- Several sections could benefit from improved clarity and cohesion; some sentences are verbose or lack precision.
- Minor typographical and grammatical issues are present, and some references are ambiguously formatted.
- The presentation of tables and figures is limited; some tabular data could be better organized to improve readability.
- The referencing style is inconsistent; explicit source details for each reference should be standardized.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer Comments

- **Title and Abstract:** The title accurately reflects the content but could be more specific by including mention of a multidisciplinary or perioperative focus. The abstract is comprehensive but somewhat lengthy; clarifying objectives and key findings upfront would improve clarity.
- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction effectively sets the context. Explicitly stating the study's aims or research questions at the end of this section would enhance focus.
- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** As a review, detailed methodology (systematic review protocols, search databases, inclusion criteria, evidence grading) is lacking, which impacts reproducibility and transparency. Incorporating such details would strengthen the manuscript.
- **Results and Discussion:** The synthesis of evidence is generally clear; however, quantification of outcomes (e.g., percentage reductions in PTPCs) and discussion of the strength and limitations of evidence would add depth.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusions are consistent with the review's content but could be more succinct. Including specific recommendations for clinical practice would reinforce practical value.
- **Ethical Clearance:** No mention of ethical approval or patient consent is provided, which is acceptable in a review but should be clarified if primary data involvement exists.
- **Language and Style:** The manuscript generally reads well, but some sentences are complex and could be simplified. Occasional typographical errors and inconsistent referencing style need correction.
- **Tables, Figures, and Formatting:** The tables are informative but could be reformatted for better clarity. The overall layout and font consistency should be improved to enhance readability.
- **References:** Citations are numerous and relevant, but the referencing format lacks uniformity; standardizing referencing style according to journal guidelines is necessary.