



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50882
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Hilo® versus Daflon® in patients suffering from hemorrhoids: A randomized, controlled, open-labelled, multicentric study
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	<p>More justification needed as to why it was an open label rather than double blinded considering risk of bias Justify the analysis on day 7, is it based on scientific findings or is it arbitrary - cite Line 114 and 148– The symptom score validation needs a comment or was it designed by the researchers? Is it reproducible? See this tool https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6394714/ Line 168-171 – was this inserted here inadvertently? Kindly recheck The discussion needs to explain what message was being passes in Section 3.3 and 3.4 since the same inferences can be made in the preceding sections – It looks repetitive</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 81 needs citation of the guidelines Line 87 needs citation or attached appendix Line 190 – consider redacting this “at baseline keeping the randomization unbiased” – adds no value Line 271,271 – move this to discussion Table 8 has subjective parameters; this row may cause some confusion The treatment made me slightly better as the Daflon group has a higher percentage. Consider redacting.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The 201 eligibility with 200 enrolment raises suspicion. The 100% follow-up of all 200 patients without any loss of follow-up also raises suspicion The disclaimer needn't be in bold letters, otherwise suspicion is raised</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Winston Makanga</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Embu Children Hospital, Kenya</i>