

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_95220
Title of the Manuscript:	Nerve damage: catastrophic complications that need to be vigilant in the clinical application of triamcinolone acetonide, two case reports
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>- the manuscript presents multiple errors in its writing, as it does not comply with the guidelines of the journal. - must be corrected in its entirety according to the journal's guidelines. - in its current version it is a very simple document. It should be retyped and updated with a longer number of bibliographical references,</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article adequate? (if not, please suggest an alternative title) The title is not suitable for this study.</p> <p>Suggestion: Case study of patients using injectable trancinolone acetone with neurological complications</p> <p>3- Is the article summary comprehensive? The abstract does not comply with the guidelines of the journal. Must be reformulated.</p> <p>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>Does not comply with all subsections of an article. The structure of the article has many errors, because it does not follow the journal's guidelines. Must be reviewed and adjusted</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>The manuscript presents errors in its presentation for not following journal's guidelines. For its publication it must be reformulated and expanded in its bibliographical references</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them on the review form. - the references are few, (only five references).. The five are current. - according to a quick survey it can be appeared that there are more articles on the topic, which could improve the work.</p> <p>Cervical transforaminal epidural steroid injections and ...https://academic.oup.com › book › chapter Since the first report in 2001, an alarming number of case reports of catastrophic neurological complications have appeared in the literature.</p> <p>(apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) This article should be improved in its structure and writing, according to the journal's guidelines. In the article, the errors located and the reviewer's suggestions are in purple. \$ and better discuss the results. Expand the bibliographic revision. - they must redo the abstract according to the journal's guidelines. - expand the introduction and define the objective of the research work. - define where and how the research was developed. - define the conclusions of the work.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	- expand the bibliographic references according to the guidelines of the journal.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Is the language/English quality of the article adequate for scholarly communications? THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE USED IS ADEQUATE	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba