

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_88728
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical Efficacy And Safety Of Oral Apremilast : Treatment Analysis For Chronic Plaque Psoriasis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>

Review Form 1.6

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The article may be an useful contribution to the journal; however, few changes and aspects should be taken into consideration by the authors before the publication process proceeds any further:</p> <p>Material & methods: authors claim '<i>..was studied in 38 patients receiving oral Apremilast with topical steroids in comparison to 36 patients who were given only topical steroids for 16 weeks..</i>' but however the numbers DO NOT add to the 78 as the total number of patients included in the study;</p> <p>while later on, it seems that the first group contains 42 patients, as opposed to only 38; authors are kindly advised to do ALL necessary corrections in order to to meet the numbers of patients in first, second group as well as total number of patients.</p> <p>As Data was non-parametric, medians are more important than means; medians should be included also.</p> <p>Repeated measures ANOVA would have been a much better statistical method to analyse the data for PASI scores, checking also for time X effect interactions between the 2 therapeutical groups, also plotting the PASI scores of the two groups against time in a Figure, to emphasise the difference in effect for the apremilast treatment would have been a plus and maybe will be included in some form in the article, too.</p> <p>Grammar and punctuation must also be carefully checked within the entire article (e.g. Among this patient's → probably authoirs have intended to write 'among these patients', as well as many more; please carefully revise the use of English language)</p> <p>authors are advised to define all abbreviations at first appearance in text.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the article an useful contribution to the journal. Therefore, I recommend the manuscript for being published after suggested changes have been taken into consideration by the authors.</p>	
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:	Mircea Tampa
Department, University & Country	Carol Davila University If Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania