

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_125652
Title of the Manuscript:	Uveitis as a Predictor for Myocardial Infarction in Patients with Behçet's Disease, Multi Centric Cohort Study from Aseer Region, Saudi Arabia.
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.	The Behçet disease (BD) paper is persuasive, in my opinion, for a number of reasons. It first successfully draws attention to the intricacy and diversity of BD, illustrating how its complex nature necessitates individualized approaches to diagnosis and therapy. Patients' and clinicians' understanding can be improved by the thorough overview provided by the focus on the various clinical symptoms, which include joint problems, eye inflammation, and oral and vaginal ulcers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Below some point should in listed Introduction Highlight the potential impact of BD on quality of life or long-term outcomes, which may underscore the importance of the study. Methods :In Mention any statistical methods use for analysis to provide insight into how results were interpreted. Results: provide more detail on the demographics of the patient cohort (e.g., age range, ethnic background) to give a clearer picture of the population studied.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Manuscript are well-structured, with clear subsections that facilitate understanding.	
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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it employs a retrospective cohort design, which is appropriate for investigating associations between uveitis and myocardial infarction in patients with Behçet's disease, allowing for the analysis of existing medical records. Second, the statistical methods used, including the appropriate tests for categorical and continuous variables, ensure that the data analysis is both rigorous and reliable. Finally, the manuscript references relevant literature to contextualize its findings, underscoring its contribution to the existing body of knowledge on Behçet's disease and related complications. Overall, the study addresses an important clinical question and employs sound methodologies to derive meaningful conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. _	References are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Pranjali Dilip Thakare
Department, University & Country	Gawande College Of Pharmacy, India