



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_50402
Title of the Manuscript:	Polypharmacy precipitating Methemoglobinemia
Type of the Article	Case study

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	<p>The case is interesting, and there may be learning points. Thus this paper can be resubmitted after complete revision.</p> <p>Throughout the paper, spacing should be revised, such as line 26 and 27. Also grammar should be improved, for example, line 27, "case" should be "a case", line 30. "65 years old female" → "A 65 year old female" Line 30-32, this sentence should be split in 2 sentences.</p> <p>Abstract Complication should be plural. Introduction The reference 1 could not be located. Please make sure that the citation is correct. Line 30 AHA should be spelled out Line 32, CKD should be spelled out Line 32 and 33, This sentence should be split in 2 sentences.</p> <p>Those mentioned above and other numerous grammatical errors distracted from reviewing the content. All these errors are to be corrected, and the paper is to be resubmitted. Authors are strongly encouraged to have an English speaking medical person to proof read the manuscript before resubmitting it.</p>	The manuscript has been modified
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>There are numerous grammatical problems. The manuscript should have been screened for the basic problems like these before it is sent to a reviewer. I am not inclined to re-review this paper unless these problems are cleared up.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	