



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_11789
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative efficacy of Amantadine Hydrochloride versus Amantadine Sulphate in treating Egyptian patients with chronic HCV
Type of the 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	In this paper the authors aimed at comparing the efficacy of amantadine hydrochloride versus amantadine sulphate in treatment of HCV naive patients. The study has many methodological flaws: 1- It is not acceptable (and probably ethical as well) to treat naive patients with a medication of unproven efficacy against HCV viremeia, except if there is solid contraindication against the standard of care Peg-IFN or its un availability. 2- The study sitting (centre) and duration (when performed) is lacking. 3- The inclusion and exclusion criteria must be defined. 4- Fifty patients selected from a total of how many? 5- Is this is a randomized trial? How randomization was done? 6- Is it an open label? Single blind? Or double blind study? 7- The investigations performed for the patients at which time point (please mention). The aim of the study was to " to evaluate the efficacy of amantadine hydrochloride versus amantadine Sulphate monotherapy when administered to naïve Egyptian patients with chronic hepatitis C ". This was not studied in the results or the discussion. The authors should compare both drugs and mention	1. I clarified that the patients had contraindication to INF based therapy. 2. The study sitting is the General Transport Authority. The study was performed in the period between November 2012 to March 2014. 3. Only patients with contraindication to Peg-IFN/RBV therapy were included. Seventy percent of the included patients were suffering from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease while thirty percent were suffering from poorly controlled diabetes. 4. From 180 patients 5. Subjects were randomized with equaldistribution to the 2 treatment regimens using block of 6 and randomization envelops were prepared by the biostatician 6. This study was open label 7. Before treatment and 6 months after treatment It had been shown that amantadine



SDI Review Form 1.6

	which is superior. 8- What are the side effects developed during the study (safety profile). 9- The use of amnatdine against HCV is not novel; in fact it was tried more that 10 years ago. Are there any studies from EGYPT to compare your results with?	hydrochloride is comparable to amantadine sulphate as regards significant reduction in liver transaminases and non significant reduction in HCV RNA viral load. 8. No side effects 9. No similar Egyptian studies
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- The author refers through the manuscript to references dated to year 2000, 2002 and,...et as recent, is it logic? (Please omit recent). 2- Table 1: the use of BMI may be better the body weight. 3- In results section: "none" to be "non". 4- In the discussion ".... were not eligible for interferon for reasons including noncompliance, medical contraindications, active substance abuse, patient preference. Perhaps amantadine may be useful in such patients. What is your evidence for this conclusion?	1. I omitted recent and I updated the references 2. I put the BMI 3. I corrected it 4. I changed it to: Perhaps amantadine may be useful in such patients especially in developing countries lacking directly acting antivirals. I said perhaps and may be; there is no evidence
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	All authors declare no conflict of interest