

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86555
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICACY OF AND SAFETY OF SECUKINUMAB IN PSORIASIS VULGARIS; A PROSPECTIVE STUDY
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>)

**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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<b>1</b> – Add the ethic review number or the protocol number related to the Institutional Review Board. <b>Methods, Parag 1.</b> <b>2</b> – This sentence describing the patients is too long. Separate, in numbers, semicolons and periods, each reason that one patient was selected for the study. After this, separate again, in the same way, the reasons why a patient was excluded. <b>Methods, Parag 1.</b> <b>3</b> – Better describe the effects of your treatment in the patients. It is not clear if the results were the same for all patients regarding their previous condition. <b>Results, Parag 4.</b> <b>4</b> – Correct the use of “till” in the Results. DO NOT use informal English in a scientific paper. <b>Results, Parag 4. Many times, through Discussion.</b> <b>5</b> – Review English through all the paper. Some informal language as also problems with punctuation should be revised.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<b>1</b> – Minor changes in writing though the text. <b>2</b> – Add the SPSS version 23.0 reference. <b>Methods, Parag 2.</b> <b>3</b> – Separate Table I by sex. <b>Results.</b> <b>4</b> – Is it relevant to your study to know the prevalence of male subjects than female subjects? I think it is not, then, I suggest you remove the paragraph. <b>Discussion, Parag 2.</b>	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guilherme Oyarzabal da Silva
Department, University & Country	University of Nebraska, Brazil