

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JAMMR_118076
Title of the Manuscript:	Ovarian Rejuvenation: Role of Autologous Stem cell therapy among Infertile women with Poor ovarian Reserve
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The present manuscript is important for scientific community because it covers a very pertinent problem in our society, which is fertility and all the challenges, often invisible and neglected, related to it. Permeates the field of biotechnology, which needs to be exhaustively debated. Therefore, it is pertinent to disseminate new concepts, such as in the case in question, ovarian rejuvenation. 2. I believe that the title of this manuscript adequately conveys its contents. Even though I would prefer to use the word "influence" or other one, instead of the word "role". 3. I believe the abstract is clear, objective and concise. What I could perceive was only a minor lack of cohesive words and a small need for improvement in the English language. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and follow a logical and understandable sequence. 5. I just got a little confused when I read in the abstract that the study started in June 2021, but in the materials and methods section I understood that the study started in June 2022. Could you please tell me which of these is correct? Regarding the phrases: "Further studies are needed to understand the same." And "Further studies are needed to evaluate the efficacy of stem cell therapy and other benefits of stem cell therapy." Couldn't they be merged into one? 6. Of the references that had a date, all were adequate and recent as far as possible 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Following the same logic as the abstract, the English language is suitable for scientific communication, what I detected was just some small lack of connective terms and some font styles that were different from the rest. But nothing that, I believe, brings demerit to the methodology, results and discussions of the present study.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I am very grateful for writing the Consent of the study participants section</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Gustav Oscar Dumke
Department, University & Country	Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of Santa Catarina, Brazil