



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_12818
Title of the Manuscript:	The effects of silymarin on serum soluble apoptosis markers in β -thalassemia major patients receiving desferrioxamine
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors try to understand the way of apoptosis in B-thalassemic patients having iron overload in a randomized double blind study. Despite the results non supporting their anti-oxidant treatment, the paper is interesting and easy to follow.	
	My personal idea would be to enrich the paper adding the iron overload data such as ferritin or better the squid data is available.	We mentioned iron parameters and liver function tests data in new published paper: Moayedi et.al.2013 A randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled study of therapeutic effects of silymarin in β -thalassemia major patients receiving desferrioxamine.
	Are there differences of treatment results among well compliant patients and not?	Poor compliant patents were withdrawn from the study.
	Would be interesting to understand if there are differences in treatment results among different genomic B-Thalassemia defects.	Absolutely, different genomic B-Thalassemia defects may affect iron overload condition in thalassemia patients. We will consider this comment in our future studies.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		