

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127864
Title of the Manuscript:	EPIDEMIOLOGICAL PROFILE OF URINARY INFECTION IN WOMEN MEDICAL STUDENTS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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 provides valuable insights into the prevalence, risk factors, and behavioral patterns contributing to UTIs within a specific, high-risk demographic that is often underrepresented in epidemiological studies. By focusing on medical students, the study also highlights the influence of academic stress, hygiene practices, and access to healthcare, offering practical implications for prevention and management strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Clear and conveys the subject of the study effectively	
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.	The abstract is well-structured and comprehensive but can be improved for clarity, conciseness, and alignment with scientific writing standards	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The abstract appears to be scientifically structured and presents a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. However, there are areas that could be refined or questioned to ensure clarity, validity, and precision in scientific communication	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not Sufficient and does not fulfil the requirements of the journal style	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Text is clear and well-structured, but some phrasing can be improved for conciseness, flow, and clarity	
Optional/General comments	Modify references and improve language The high contamination rate (70.7%) deserves more detailed exploration. Was this due to collection techniques, or does it indicate an endemic issue with sample handling	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kanamala Arun Chand Roby
Department, University & Country	Vignan Pharmacy College, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, India