

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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 highlight that part in the manu his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
	This research in determining the prevalence of PCOS in a tertiary hospital is an observational study. Introduction: Review and aims are satisfactory. Method: Needs to be clear as to how subjects were recruited and where they were recruited. The sample appears to be convenient-this should be stated and its inherent bias. Elaborate that the type of patient presenting (see comments) – for subfertility, menstrual irregularity, etc , that those fulfilling the criteriawere recruited (for PCOS). These subjects were then evaluated for the variables ?demography and signs and symptoms (kindly see comments in text). Results. Presented satisfactorily . Comments related to the figures should be stated in narrative. Some of this appears under Discussion. Discussion: This section is well presented. Conlusions are acceptable. References. This requires much attention – the format needs to adhere to that of the Journal (Vancouver style). Limitations of the study and how sample size need to be stated.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Methods requires major revision with sample size calculation and sampling technique.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with that part in the manuscript. It is m feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sivalingam Nalliah
Department, University & Country	International Medical University, Malaysia

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her