

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.	This is a very important topic and obviously would create lot of interest among health care providing clinicians especially the Haematologists.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Up to mark	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	While going through the manuscript, I have noted certain points which need the attention of worthy authors	
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.	a. References too less. Ideally each statement must be supported by a reference. The cited references are too old only one reference is an article published in 2017. Rest all are more than 10-15 years old	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	b. In the manuscript the units of platelets are varying between thousand/ul and 10 ⁹ /l. Uniformity of the need.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	c. Random grammatical mistakes are frequently seen. It would be better to show the manuscript to an English writing expert before submission	
Minor REVISION comments	d. Which software used for statistical analysis?	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	e. Conclusion in main manuscript is missing	
Optional/General comments	This is an excellent study by the article needs major rewriting by an academic writing expert.	

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:	Tahir Jameel
Department, University & Country	King Abdulaziz University Jeddah, Saudi Arabia