

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_103985
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the Dose of Oral Dexamethasone vs. Oral Prednisone in the Treatment of Acute Lumbar Radicular Pain: A Cohort Study
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:

(<https://www.journalajorrin.com/index.php/AJORRIN/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This study has no importance for the scientific community. Title is not suitable. Entire sections are not appropriate. There are repeated data. Subsections are not structured well. Only the results were repeated in the discussion and conclusion sections and there needs to be discussed with the current literature. Oral steroid usage is not a medical approach that supported by the treatment guidelines. Method is wrong. Such issues like sample size calculation, ethical approval and randomization should be clarified. The way of interpreting and writing the results of statistical analysis is wrong. Most of the figures are unnecessary and confusing. References are not recent. Add recent references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ilker Ilhanli
Department, University & Country	Ondokuz Mayıs University, Türkiye