Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_70526**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Case Report On Steroid- Responsive Encephalopathy In A Case Of Hashimoto's Thyroiditis**
Type of the Article	**Case Report**

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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

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	The author should concentrate on the case reporting and present the report as such. The abstract should follow the standard format of introduction, method used, results and conclusion. The method has not been expressed in the abstract. The pathoaetiology and therapeutic modalities of Hashimoto thyroiditis should be organized well. There was no method on work done on systematic review so there should be no conclusion on such. The history and clinical findings should be presented chronologically. In text references should be provided for factual statements made. The paper should be reorganized to suit the topic and appropriate conclusion should be made.	Revision amended Correction made Done revision
Minor REVISION comments	There should be English editing of the paper. There are incomplete statements (e.g. Hashimoto is a Japanese word that translates to.) Grammatical errors are too many in the paper. Punctuation and spacing should be checked and corrected (e.g. to " In the United States). Typographical errors should be corrected e.g. Paediatric not peadiatric. The contents of Relevant past interventions with outcome have been repeated under timelines. All abbreviations should be written in full when first introduced e.g. AVBRH Units should be written well e.g. mmHg not mm/hg The type of diabetes should be stated (mellitus or insipidus) The bibliography should follow a standard reference style.	Corrected Suggested revisions made Done revision
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)***	