

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78494
Title of the Manuscript:	Case Report on Hemolytic Uremic Syndrome
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The work itself is a photograph of a case of hemolytic uremic syndrome in a 6-year-old girl. However, it leaves the message that it seems to want to give, namely that only cortisone therapy for os is the only choice. When, on the other hand, apheretic therapies, immunosuppressive drugs and intravenous bolus cortisone is the extreme choice, before getting a 6-year-old child to dialysis only. Left in these conditions even kidney transplantation risks becoming ineffective, if not at risk. So in my opinion the work must give a complete message that in these dramatic cases, a much more aggressive therapy should be set . And if it has not been set, explain why the orientation towards a less aggressive therapy was chosen: precarious clinical conditions of the small patient? Unavailability of apheretic services and pediatric intensive care ?</p> <p>In other words , Sending a message like cortisone is enough to treat a hemolytic uremic syndrome is dangerous and misleading. Especially if we are talking about a 6-year-old girl</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Ennio Duranti
Department, University & Country	Arezzo Hospital , Italy