

Manuscript : “Neutrophil - Lymphocyte Ratio as a Reliable Predictor of Postoperative Outcome And Mortality In Delayed Cases Of Peripheral Arterial Embolism”

Submitted: 29 June 2020

Accepted: 16 September 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Dr. Lefter Nasto

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p36

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Choua Ouchemi, Tchad

Reviewer 2: Shabani Zamira
Univesity Of Shkodra”Luigj Gurakuqi”, Shkoderr, Albania

Reviewer 3: T Khetam Al eide, Jordan

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Choua Ouchemi	Email:
University/Country: CHAD	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/08/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/12/20
Manuscript Title: NEUTROPHIL - LYMPHOCYTE RATIO AS A RELIABLE PREDICTOR OF POSTOPERATIVE OUTCOME AND MORTALITY IN DELAYED CASES OF PERIPHERAL ARTERIAL EMBOLISM	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 34.07.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(The title of this article is clear and is adequate to the content of the article)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>(The abstract clearly presents objects, method and results)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(There are not grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(The study methods are explained clearly)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The references are comprehensive and appropriate, there is an error between reference 6 and 7 to be correct)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):none, manuscript is clear and well documented.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:Only one mistake in the referencies to be correct.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Prof. As.Dr. ZAMIRA SHABANI	
University/Country: UNIVESITY OF SHKODRA"LUIGJ GURAKUQI", SHKODERR, ALBANIA	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/07/2020
Manuscript Title: NEUTROPHIL - LYMPHOCYTE RATIO AS A RELIABLE PREDICTOR OF POSTOPERATIVE OUTCOME AND MORTALITY IN DELAYED CASES OF PERIPHERAL ARTERIAL EMBOLISM	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 34.07.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>The abstract is correct and clearly</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some mistake or errors during the typing</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methods is clearly</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>The body of the paper is clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Everything is ok</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thank you for effort to publish your work

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Khetam.M. Al Eidi	
University/Country: Jordan	
Date Manuscript Received: mon, Jul,13,2020	Date Review Report Submitted: August 5, 2020
Manuscript Title: NEUTROPHIL - LYMPHOCYTE RATIO AS A RELIABLE PREDICTOR OF POSTOPERATIVE OUTCOME AND MORTALITY IN DELAYED CASES OF PERIPHERAL ARTERIAL EMBOLISM	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 34.07.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
(The population of the study should be appeared in the title)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	2

results.	
The abstract is long. It should focus, briefly, on the aim of the study, the method, the population, and the results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The study needs spelling and punctuation review.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Study methods should include the study population, sample of the study, Instrument of the study, instrument validity and stability.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
The body of the paper should contain previous published studies. In addition to discussion of them. Farther more the statement of the study problem, the significance, The aims o the study should be mentioned.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The discussion needs more interpretation and analysis.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Remove numbers of the references, Reorganize them depending on APA a system	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The abstract is long. It should focus on the aims of the study, the method, the population, and the results.
- The study needs spelling and punctuation review.
- Study methods should include the study population, sample of the study, Instrument of the study, instrument validity and stability.
- The body of the paper should contain previous published studies. In addition to discussion of them. Farther more the statement of the study problem, the significance, The aims o the study should be mentioned.
- The discussion needs more interpretation and analysis.
- Remove numbers of the references, Reorganize them depending on APA a system