

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Overall the study seems well conducted and the study well written.</p> <p>I would like it to be better clarified in the introduction why it was chosen to conduct this study and why in Jamaica.</p> <p>In the Results it is not immediately clear who was treated with finasteride and who with dutasteride.</p> <p>The Conclusion is too concise, I would also speak a little about other adverse events (at least one more sentence).</p> <p>By fixing these little things, I like the rest.</p>	<p>Whilst the adverse effects of 5-ARIs are well recognized, there may be variability in their prevalence in different populations due to cultural and psychological differences. Therefore, it is imperative to establish the prevalence of these adverse effects in the local population of a practicing urologist.</p> <p>The distinction of the 5-ARI was stated in the self reported effects (table 2). However, the distinction was not made for the sexual and depression scores (table 4) but could be inferred from table 3. The aim was not to compare the 5-ARIs</p> <p>The conclusion was modified to include “Depression and gynaecomastia are not recognized short term adverse effects of 5-ARIs”</p>

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>	