

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_100882
Title of the Manuscript:	Safety Profile of Methotrexate in Patients with Rheumatoid Arthritis
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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><b>Compulsory</b> 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. Yes, because it allows assessing the usefulness of methotrexate at certain doses in rheumatoid arthritis and the occurrence of bearable adverse effects in patients</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. It must be reformulated based on the sections that correspond to an original article: introduction, objective, methods, results and conclusion.</p> <p>4. The methodology could be divided into subsections to better illustrate the phases of the investigation</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references must be updated to recent years, due to the type of article in question</p> <p>It is necessary to review the logical sequence between paragraphs and the correspondence between the different sections of the article</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	can be improved	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Specify aspects that are requested in various parts of the manuscript and properly use the writing rules	

### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>José Ander Asenjo Alarcón</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Autonomous University of Chota, Peru</b>