



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_48352
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation of features of Allergic rhinitis and Allergic conjunctivitis with Treatment Modalities
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:

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

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	<p>The authors have not followed basic guidelines of representing an original paper into the ABSTRACT</p> <p>The results do not add clarity to the basic questions posed by the study</p> <p>The conclusions are grossly inadequate and mere speculation. More robust data need to be added</p> <p>The statistical data added with p-values do not make any sense as correlation parameters are not provided</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sample size calculation need to be shown 2. The article should read in only one tense (past) 3. Degree of severity assessment with rank values not shown 4. Questionnaire needs to be shown as used in the study 5. Why were so young children and elderly included in the study? 	<p>The abstract has been re-written following the standard headings Introduction.Objectives,Methodology,Results and conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.All the patients seen who met the inclusion criteria within the period of the study who consented were enrolled for the study 2.The tense has been corrected 4.I am afraid we don't want to make the questionnaire public 5.Those are the categories of the patients who presented to our institution.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Specific IgE levels not provided in the study, although authors mention using immunotherapy as an option to treat patients</p> <p>How was the IT protocol followed? Was ethical approval obtained?</p> <p>What IT medication was used, source needs to be mentioned, unless not approved by Ethics Council</p>	<p>We didn't aim at including the specific IgE level in the study.</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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>Ethical Approval not provided particularly as children and extreme elderly included in the study</p>	<p>A statement of such has been added after conclusion</p>