

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_102809
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Pulse Dose Methylprednisolone in a Cohort of very Severe Covid-19 Patients in a resource-limited setting in Myanmar: a retrospective study
Type of the 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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/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>Methyl prednisolone pulse dose treatment for COVID patient's outcome has been vastly studied and published. Further studies in this area lack value addition to existing knowledge.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Sample size is not sufficient to calculate the mentioned statistics</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is well written, but lacks need and new information. The rationale for conducting the study needs to be established. The study duration was also very less to be considered under retrospective record review study.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	D. Sujatha
Department, University & Country	Sri Padmavati Mahila Visvavidyalayam, India