

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_127083
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of high dose pulse methylprednisolone (somidex) vs oral prednisolone for treatment of newly diagnosed idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura in Rajavithi hospital:open labelled randomized controlled trial.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There are very many studies of treatment approaches to immune thrombocytic purpura. The authors simply wished to analyse their data of pulse methyl prednisolone versus oral prednisolone. It is well known that both produce equal results, albeit at varying time points. The oral dosing may cause acid peptic disease and symptoms of chronic high dose steroids.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Ideally, it should be a concurrent randomised, double blind trial. And, apart from simply documenting platelet count, toxicity from chronic high dose oral steroid use for 12 weeks should be highlighted.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need clarification of what is meant from this in the last 2 paragraphs. It may mean anything for the reader.	
Optional/General comments	None	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	D Raghunadharao
Department, University & Country	MNJ Institute of Oncology, India