



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50190
Title of the Manuscript:	Hyperemesis gravidarum, Wernicke's encephalopathy and Korsakoff syndrome looked through the lens of three cases, Paper II.
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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Line 39 - change 'Korsakoff syndromeand' to 'Korsakoff syndrome,' Line 45 - change 'timeline' to 'time-line' Line 45 - change 'sociodemographic' to 'socio-demographic' Line 46 - change 'semistructured' to 'semi-structured'	All words separated by hyphen (-), though these words are used without hyphen as well, and highlighted in yellow. Thanks for your suggestion.
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?	<i>If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> The author mentioned that 'oral' consent were sought from the patient for publication of their data and permission from the director of the hospital. The proper thing to do is to get a written consent. Even if the patients are not literate, it can be read and translated to them in a language they can understand and then asked to sign it if they accepted. There is also need for an ethical review board to approve the work and not just the medical director of the hospital. At the end of the work the author said written consent was gotten from the patients. Please reconcile these two conflicting statements and stick to what was really done	We very well understand the value of written informed consent and it should be the ideal method. But sometimes, when patients insist for oral version we should accept their opinion or we loss the patient. They often suggest their identity details should be kept confidential and anonymized and as we did so in these three cases. At the end of the paper we corrected our unintentional mistake; "written" is changed by "oral". We obtained permission from Medical director supports for the publication of these case reports. Thank You Very Much for your critical comments