

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_131040
Title of the Manuscript:	THE PREVALENCE OF 5 ALPHA REDUCTASE INHIBITOR ADVERSE EVENTS IN PATIENTS WITH BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERPLASIA IN JAMAICA
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is important to conduct a study on the adverse effects of commonly used medicines. It might be crucial detecting adverse effects especially due to multipl medicine use in group of older people. It is quite common to take 5 alpha reductase inhibitor because of BPH. Therefore, this study may contribute to the literature.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It's suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	While the abstarct results mentioned a significant decrease in erectile dysfunction, the number of people experiencing erectile dysfunction was not clearly mentioned. I think this is a bit confusing.	An average reduction in the MSHQ erection score from baseline to after 5-ARI in the cohort of 80 patients was noted, while only 2 patients reported erectile dysfunction as an adverse effect which is stated in the self-reported effects.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not fully up to date but sufficient	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it's suitable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Although the small number of patients and the heterogeneity of 5 alpha reductase types seem to be limitations of the study, I found it generally sufficient	

PART 2:

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