



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_18891
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical and immunological evaluation of application of Ronkoleukin in nonspecific vulvovaginitisatadolescent girls
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>)



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>1)The paper written with very poor English.(you can see it just from the first paragraph as like"According to immunological parameters there was found that during the sub-acute there is the secondary immune deficiency and the immunodeficiency is absent during the acute. During the acute phagocytic function of the local secret is satisfactory, and during the sub acute against satisfactory absorption function there is a decrease of bacterial growth-inhibitory activity of vaginal secretions, indicating the necessity of correction of phagocytic component of these patients."")</p> <p>2) too many tables with incorrect format.</p> <p>3) the background and need for using Ronkoleukin in such a benign and usually transient disease of vulvovaginitis could not be explained. And is there any need to use it for such a disease? Ethical issue?</p> <p>4) conclusion section is too long and i didnot agree with the statement that " Application of Ronkoleukin can reduce treatment costs and shorten the time of</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	treatment.”	
Minor REVISION comments	Ethical Issue: No sentence about the ethical committee approval is provided. And also I think, it concerns some ethical issue that using such a sophisticated drug for vulvovaginitis.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Yüzüncü Yıl University, Turkey