



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_19334
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Buprenorphine and Bupropion in the treatment of Methamphetamine dependency and Craving
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 abstract is very short and incomplete. It does not report the type of study and there is a description of the case. While reading it, I thought that the study had other methodology.</p> <p>In the case report, I did not understand why bupropion was used rather than buprenorphine. The discussion should be increased and improved. Other texts on assunto should be cited.</p> <p>Ethical issue: It is a case report. However, the text does not say if there was patient consent, if an informed consent form was signed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The paragraphing and the spacing of the text are not well configured. The English should also be improved. References need to be standardized in the same way.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Matias Carvalho Aguiar Melo
Department, University & Country	Department of Medical Sciences, Universidade Federal do Ceará, Brazil