

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_88615
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF HYDROXYUREA ON BLOOD TRANSFUSION RATE IN PATIENTS OF BETA THALASSEMIA MAJOR
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p><b><u>Abstract</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Review aspects of English style and grammar.</li><li>➤ Review the correct way of communicating the P-value according to journal requirements.</li><li>➤ Correct use of abbreviations in the abstract.</li></ul> <p><b><u>Aim</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ As for the aim I consider that it should be added as one more: to describe the main characteristics of the study population. For this is essentially what is done in the results shown by the authors.</li></ul> <p><b><u>Methodological Design</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ I consider that the methodological elements in this report are insufficient and give rise to doubts. It is not defined whether or not it is a quasi-experimental study, although from some elements it seems that it is. The population and sample size are not defined. There is talk of variables that are not analysed or shown later in the results, such as adverse drug reactions. The elements that were taken into account to define one or the other study group are not clearly defined. Ethical aspects should be discussed in more detail.</li></ul> <p><b><u>Results</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Correct the design of the tables according to the points made in the report.</li></ul> <p><b><u>Discussion</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ The discussion should be further enriched</li></ul> <p><b><u>Conclusions</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ They should give an outlet for the objectives and succinctly express the main findings of the research without being a literal exposition of the results.</li></ul> <p><b><u>References</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Correct points made regarding references and citation style in the text.</li></ul>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Correct spelling and typographical errors in the report to the authors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I consider it necessary to thoroughly review the report of this research and rectify the errors pointed out, and once corrected, its publication can be considered.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Orlando Téllez Almenares</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cuba</b>