



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_24780
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Magnesium Sulphate on Hepatic Biomarkers in Pre-eclamptic Patients in Selected Tertiary Hospitals in Osun State South Western Nigeria
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I recommend attending the observations. Abstract . It is mentioned that “This study investigated the effect of Magnesium Sulphate on cardiac biomarkers in the management of preeclampsia”. This is incorrect. This study analyzed hepatic biomarkers. Introduction. In the actual classification of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, the concept of Pregnancy Induced Hypertension is not used, as the authors affirm in the Introduction. Justification. It's not justified the objective of this study; there is no evidence in the literatures of liver damage, caused by magnesium sulphate. Material & methods. - The statistical procedure for sampling estimation, is not described. - The criteria for selection of subjects are incorrect. The authors describe the subject recruitment, data collection, etc; but not selection criteria. Results. The statistical presentation of the results are appropriate. Discussion. The analysis presented in the discussion, is consistent with the	Thank you, it was actually a mix up, the correction has been done. Sir/Ma, as much as we could understand your point on the introduction, we can only submit that, generally as the norm is, introduction entails review of literatures, and so the statements made are collections of experts' views on the subject matter. We do not have authority over them. On justification, the justification of our study was captured between lines 67 and 70. Even though the literatures have not given evidence of liver damage caused by $MgSO_4$, but is a common knowledge that liver plays a principal role in drug metabolism. So, if $MgSO_4$ is employed commonly in the management of pre-eclampsia, it is somewhat justifiable to investigate the benefit (or otherwise) of $MgSO_4$ on hepatic biomarkers, which are indicators of the state of the liver. We did not use a particular statistical procedure for sampling estimation. However,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	results. Conclusion. The conclusion, is based on data obtained in the investigation.	our sampling method was obviously purposeful, and the unequal group sample size was due to the peculiarity of some of the groups. We however, appreciate your comments on our results, discussion and conclusion. Thank you sir/ma for your valuable observation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I recommend attending the observations. In addition to the limitations referred in Materials & methods; the formation of groups of analysis are asymmetrical. The aspects listed above, may cause bias in the final results. Considering the widely studied, effects of Magnesium Sulphate in preeclampsia, and their favorable therapeutic results. I can not find a scientific justification for this study. A scientific background to be highlighted is the research of The Magpie Trial Collaborative Group (The Lancet. Vo 359.June 1, 2002). Possibly the authors know this work. It considers that there is an ethical dilemma in this study. The control group of preeclamptic women, apparently does not receive an alternative treatment to prevent possible complications of the disease (seizures for example). How do the authors explain this situation ??	