

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2689
Title of the Manuscript:	CLINICAL EFFICACY OF PYRIDOXINE AND MEFENAMIC ACID ALONE AND IN COMBINATION IN PREMENSTRUAL SYNDROME
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a interesting study regarding the impact of pyridoxin in pathophysiology of premsntrual syndrome, and this study show that with intervention of pyridoxin administration in treating PMS that show no effect of addition. Show it might not be deficiency of pyridoxin causing PMS	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	suitbale	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract was comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is comparative study of two group intervention with mefeneemic acid alone and mefenemc plus pyridoxin along with placebo group emphasize the result that pyridoxin was not showing any benefecila effect of treating PMS. The statistic trst was done and showed a significinacy among group of meenemic compare to the other group and with pyridoxin as well. This study was a prospective with randomized study well designed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References was sufficient	

**Review Form2**

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	suitable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No comment	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Binarwan Halim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Prima Indonesia, Indonesia</b>