



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50930
Title of the Manuscript:	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Residing on Blue Diamond Society of Dhumbarahi, Kathmandu, Nepal: A Social Life Perspective
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>Abstract It is good that the abstract has not brought out clearly what the study investigated- to determine the social life of LGBTI living at blue diamond society.</p> <p>The author did well to state the major findings of the study. However a brief statement about the authors' view of the implications of these findings is required.</p> <p>Introduction The introduction is appropriately written since it is related to the topic or title.</p> <p>The knowledge gap has been clearly stated about how few studies have examined the issues faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual and Transgender (LGBT)- prevented families in relation to their access to and satisfaction with health care services for their Children. However the project being evaluated has not been described sufficiently. The aim/objective/purpose of the study section needed to be stated in the introduction.</p> <p>Methods Research design/methodology used is appropriate though it is not fully described and justified. The population has been stated, but the manuscript does not provide rationale for selecting the methods that have been used for data collection. It would be interesting if the researcher clearly show how data was analyzed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your positive comments.</p> <p>The aim/objective/purpose of the study section has been stated in the introduction. The data analysis procedure has been stated in revised manuscript.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Results It's good to note that findings are not merely stated, but also explained in relation to the topic. Its also great that the findings are related to the objectives.</p> <p>Discussion Discussion section repeats the presentation of findings discuss/analyze them in relation to objectives which is good. It would be appreciated if the quantitative data can be backed up with qualitative explanation.</p> <p>Conclusion The conclusions are derived from findings which is good. The conclusions are appropriate and are emphatically stated. It would be appreciated if some recommendations are stated which are derived from the conclusion and findings.</p>	<p>Thank you for your positive comments. All the suggestions has been incorporated in revised manuscript.</p> <p>In discussion part findings has been repeated to show the comparisons with other studies. It will be easier for readers to compare.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>This is an important topic of discussion which is original and deserves to be published after the above corrections are made.</p>	<p>Thank You for your positive feedback.</p>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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