

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5111

Title: Paroxetine versus pregabalin for the management of neuropathic pain in multiple sclerosis

Reviewer code: 00860822

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2013-08-16 10:39

Date reviewed: 2013-08-21 04:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study compared the analgesic effect of paroxetine and pregabalin in patients with multiple sclerosis, and finally the study was ceased due to high attrition rates in the paroxetine. For this research, I have some issues as follows: 1. For the comparison of the therapeutic effects of drugs with different mechanisms, no good reasons were presented why the authors did so. I cannot get the equal effective dose of both drugs when referring to morphine or something else. 2. The study used the two drugs with different duration, so it is difficult to say which one is superior to another. 3. A total of 21 patients were recruited, for this number, I am confused from the description. The authors should spell out the values they used to calculate the sample size. I attempted to recalculate it, but failed because of the values are unknown. 4. Why the investigators chose the doses of the drugs?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5111

Title: Paroxetine versus pregabalin for the management of neuropathic pain in multiple sclerosis

Reviewer code: 00860826

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2013-08-16 10:39

Date reviewed: 2013-08-24 23:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for the opportunity to review the study “Paroxetine versus pregabalin for the management of neuropathic pain in multiple sclerosis” submitted by DA Turcotte et al. The primary aim was to compare the analgesia effect and improve of quality of daily life quality by the administration of Paroxetine and Pregabalin in neuropathic pain patients with multiple sclerosis (MS). The study was well designed and written given the consideration of various factors confounding in this particular patients population. Due to the unanticipated high attrition rate, a near 50% in Paroxetine group, and 20% in Pregabalin group, the statistical comparison is less reliable and prevented any conclusion could be drawn from the current study. As the authors pointed out in their discussion, although there were many reports indicating that both analgesics were well tolerated and effective in alleviate neuropathic pain for patients without MS. It is not known this is because of drug selection, or the same clinical neuropathic pain in MS patient carries a different neurophysiology. The current study once again demonstrates that there is significant challenge in management the chronic neuropathic pain in patient with MS. The authors should be congratulated to have such a courage to explore this difficult territory, the results still would raised the awareness and advice the proper treatment choice in the pain management society. This is just my personal suggestion that if the editor would consider the acceptance with a revision for rapid communication. A typo in page 4, the 2nd line from the bottom: medication regimen. As such, (in) it many cases, it is difficult to attain therapeutic dosages

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5111

Title: Paroxetine versus pregabalin for the management of neuropathic pain in multiple sclerosis

Reviewer code: 00529915

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2013-08-16 10:39

Date reviewed: 2013-08-25 18:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Hi Dear Your idea was good and clinically relevant but many limitations (which were acknowledged by you in the manuscript) may make it unjustifiable to publish as RCT. Limitations are low recruitment and non-blinding. A cross over study could have been better under these circumstances. However work is not valueless. I would suggest it would be more appropriate if you try to publish this pilot-work in the format of short communication . Thank you.