



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_14216
Title of the Manuscript:	The efficacy of intravenous immunoglobulin in the treatment of patients with acute disseminated encephalomyelitis
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	1-The authors do not mention the criteria to define therapeutic groups. Was it a double blind study? The study design is not clear. 2-The authors mention that according to indications some patients received methylprednisolone. What indications? Were there patients in the control group who did not receive any immunological treatment? 3-What exactly means vascular metabolic treatment? 4-The authors do not specify statistical methods used. 5-The doses should be reviewed. 0.4 mg/Kg or 0.4 g/Kg? 6-The authors conclusions are that they proved a positive therapeutic and that monthly administration is of great prognostic importance. These conclusions can not be taken from a study with such methodological deficiencies. A critical discussion of the results should be provided.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Yes. The authors do not mention ethical board approval. The authors do not mention if patients or legal representative signed informed consent form, which seems imperative for a therapeutic study. Also, there is a serious problem with the control group, i.e., the treatment in this group should be clarified.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	France