

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_99349
Title of the Manuscript:	Transgenders: The Neglected Group in Health care
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-The manuscript is about transgenders people in India and their health problems when they seek service from Health care centres. It does not seem to be very important for scientific communities.</p> <p>2- It is suitable.</p> <p>3-Abstract is not structural and had nothing about the aim of the study, but it is rather comprehensive.</p> <p>4- No.</p> <p>5-I think so.</p> <p>6-They are not sufficient but recent.</p> <p>7-Introduction is too short and without any references and no aim for the study.</p> <p>8-I think methodology is a part of introduction because it is only literature review.</p> <p>9- There is no number for the text references.</p> <p>10-What are 0.98 and 0.67 in page 3.</p> <p>11-In page 4 what is the test which was performed?</p> <p>12-What is M=4.46 in page 4?</p> <p>13-Percent with one decimal places.</p> <p>14-The title of analysis does not fit the content, because we have no data to analyse.</p> <p>15-In page 6, to which test the p-values are related?</p> <p>16-In discussion there is not any references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, but needs some correction.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Masoud Roudbari
Department, University & Country	Iran University of Medical Sciences, Iran