

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71216
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COMBINATION OF ORAL TRANEXAMIC ACID WITH MODIFIED KLIGMAN'S FORMULA VERSUS ORAL TRANEXAMIC ACID WITH AZELAIC ACID 15% IN THE TREATMENT OF MELASMA
Type of the Article	Study protocol

### **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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>In general, this work needs major revision in grammar and language. Some of the specific comments are:</b></p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The information on the burden is scanty. In the first paragraph, you need to elaborate more on the burden along with the technical information on melasma. Your narrative to present the sites of melasma are confusing. Perhaps, you might use appropriate punctuations to present each of these location and define them clearly.</li> <li>2. You are suggested to separate and present treatment aspect in different paragraph. You also need to re-structure the whole paragraph. For example, this sentence does not mean anything: "Used in combination along with - glycolic, azelaic and kojic acid, retinoic acid, or sometimes even corticosteroids. <sup>[1]</sup> ????? Also, please correct the position of the citation (check all).</li> </ol> <p><b>Rationale</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Although you have mentioned in the method section, you are also suggested to provide the specific name of the country where your study will be conducted. You have not described the place where you are conducting your study. Perhaps, it would add more value if you can also explain the situation of melasma in your country.</li> <li>4. What is your research hypothesis? For example, do you believe that formulation A is more effective than formulation B? Once this information is clear, then other sections will be easy to follow.</li> </ol> <p><b>Objective</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Why are you using the term "effectiveness" and "efficacy" at the same time. Are these terms same and used interchangeably?</li> </ol> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. What is/are the reason/s of choosing the age group (18-50) for your study. Are other population not vulnerable to melasma? Or is it related to safety?</li> <li>7. What are the variables that will be included for the study? What will be independent and dependent variables? These will also have us understand the basis of sample size calculation.</li> </ol> <p><b>Sample size:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. What is the basis of using 4% prevalence for calculating the sample size? Isn't 60 samples too less for intervention study? What about the size for different</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>treatment groups?</p> <p>9. Why again “Methodology”???????</p> <p>10. Describe in detail how will you address ethical issues? This is extremely important for intervention study, and more so, for the study protocol. Simply writing “IEC approval will be obtained” does not convey any message anything.</p> <p>11. Suggested to improve the description of MASl with proper structure and format. The current presentation is not so clear and looks messy.</p> <p>12. Please take ethical issues in the same section and describe them together instead of presenting it haphazardly.</p> <p><b>STATISTICS:</b></p> <p>13. Can you mention some specific test relevant to your study?</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>14. At the end of the discussion, you are suggested to provide the gist/summary of the studies you have described? This summary should identify gaps in the past studies, which will be the basis (impetus) for your study.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>1. Check grammar and spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Main body</b></p> <p>2. Once you give the abbreviation of the terms, use them consistently throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Please reformat your references. They are not consistent.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tsheten</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Australian National University, Australia</b>