

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International STD Research &amp; Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_I-SRR_119775</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE AND SEXUAL QUALITY OF LIFE IN PATIENTS WITH DHAT SYNDROME</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Culture-bound syndromes have found a place in the classification of diseases, and although they are defined specifically for geographical regions, they are syndromes seen almost all over the world in many different manifestations. In this respect, studies on culture-bound syndromes will benefit the scientific community, especially in the field of psychiatry.</li> <li>2. The title of the article is appropriate.</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article adequately reflects the content of the article.</li> <li>4. Subsections and structure of the article are generally considered appropriate.</li> <li>5. The explanation was expressed in general comments.</li> <li>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First of all, detailed information regarding the ethics committee permission of the study should be shared (such as meeting date and decision number).</li> <li>2. The materials and methods section lacks the necessary detail. There is no explanation as to how the number of patients included in the study was determined to obtain sociodemographic data.</li> <li>3. Reference for B.G. Prasad scales should be stated.</li> <li>4. It should be stated in which language the SQOL-M scale is used. If it is used in a language other than English, a reference should be made to the reliability and validity study of that language.</li> <li>5. It is noteworthy that other studies on Dath syndrome were generally conducted in people over age of 18. Similarly, it has been observed that the SQOL-M scale is generally used for people over the age of 18. Information regarding the suitability of the SQOL-M scale should be provided for patients aged 16-18 included in the study; if it is not suitable, participants aged 16-18 should not be evaluated.</li> <li>6. Although the results and discussion sections are under the same title in the publication structure of the journal, it is noticeable that there is a lot of numerical data in the discussion section. The discussion section should compare the results of the study with the results of other studies, but the numerical data should be more limited. Too much numerical data in the discussion section is not beneficial for the readers and disrupts the fluidity of the discussion.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	In summary, numerical data should be collected in the results section as much as possible.	
--	--	--

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ahmethan Turan
Department, University & Country	Bozkir State Hospital, Turkey