



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50476
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of PCOS with associated symptoms and complications at a Tertiary care Hospital of Karachi.
Type of the Article	Original 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no correlation between introduction, title and the objective of the study <p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why did the authors seek the US National Library of medicine ethical approval for the study ? - This is not a clinical trial so therefore there is no reason to register this study on clinicaltrial.gov as well <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please write results in past tense (ex: Line 89) - The signposting of a table should precede the table and not follow it - Please use atleast one table to represent data <p>Title vs Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Title says that the study tries to evaluate the characteristics of PCOS patients - Methods say patients with all gynaecologic disorders were taken up for the study and PCOS was further diagnosed - It has to be made clear if the study was to evaluate the prevalence and characteristics of PCOS or was done to evaluate all gynaecologic disorders and then PCOS was diagnosed <p>Title vs Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conclusion is more in line with analysis of gynaecologic disorders wherein the authors have found PCOS to be a common occurrence and hence the authors have elucidated the features of PCOS rather than putting PCOS at the centre stage of the study (with reference to the title) <p>Title</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unclear, prevalence of PCOS with symptoms and complications..... or PCOS with the prevalence of symptoms and complications <p>Referencing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 82 - Ybarra 2016 (reference not found in reference section) - Place the reference number in square brackets when cited in the text 	<p>Introduction: Corrected and incorporated</p> <p>Method: Corrected</p> <p>Results: Corrected and incorporated</p> <p>Discussion: To best of our knowledge this is the first that determined the prevalence of PCOS among gynaecological disorder in Tertiary care hospital of Karachi, Pakistan. The study which was mentioned by reviewer was a survey based study involving disease free women of reproductive age of Malaysia.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Title vs Methodology: Corrected</p> <p>Title vs Conclusions: Corrected</p> <p>Referencing: Done</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please write background <p>Grammatical mistakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are several grammatical and sentence structure mistakes in the text (please get the manuscript checked by a language expert or a native speaker) 	<p>Added as per recommendation.</p> <p>Grammatical mistakes: Done</p>
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is essential to line number the manuscript before submitting it for review, as per the journals protocol. As the same was not done by the authors, the reviewer had to line number the manuscript and the authors may refer to the same for understanding the review comments. 	<p>Incorporated</p>



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issue as it was a descriptive study and privacy of the patients was highly maintained