

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_112800
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of Intense-pulsed light and modified kligman's formula versus Intense-pulsed light alone in the treatment of moderate to severe melasma.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title of the study is not framed correctly. The triple combination formula names are mentioned partially. The title doesn't include the tool "MASI" & place of study. • The Title & objective doesn't match each other. • Objective doesn't mention about MASI scale used. • "Safety" is mentioned in objective but not in Title. • Triple combination formula must be mentioned in Title & Objective. • Efficacy and effectiveness are both interchangeably used, creating a confusion, as efficacy should be applied to IPL & effectiveness should be applied to triple combination as its not controlled by the researcher. • In "Discussion", Author mentioned, "To evaluate the effect.....". So, Whether the study is to evaluate or to assess or determine ??mention which is appropriate. • Hypothesis is not generated in the beginning. • In Introduction 1st paragraph- Incidence & prevalence rate not mentioned. • Introduction 2nd paragraph- Author initially mentioned that melasma pathogenesis is not well understood & next lines mentioned about the etiopathogenesis. So, both the statements are contradictory to each other in same paragraph. Write the exact fact. • Introduction 6th para- Its "Frequency" of IPL, not fluency. • Materials & Methods- Sex not mentioned, Study area incomplete, MASI scale not mentioned as a tool, Research type, design, sampling technique, estimation of sample size?? • Need for study – not promising. • In Results/Side effects- Total % of subjects suffered from mild erythema & dryness of skin not mentioned in Grp A & Grp B. Side effects paragraph repeated twice. • The whole study is focused on management or treatment of melasma is not mentioned clearly. Both the words are used interchangeably. • Mention "Subjects" instead of Patients in the study. • Grp B pre-test & post-test images not shown. • In Discussion 3rd para- The rate of indoor workers was 38 (84.4%) in group -A and 34 (79.1%) in group -B. – Numbers not matching. • In Discussion 6th para- Tretinoin (0.025%) is mentioned & 0.05% in Abstract. Tretinoin's which formulation % is correct?? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Good	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Mansi Chinchankar
Department, University & Country	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, India