

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</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>Answer 1: This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores a novel approach to addressing infertility in women with poor ovarian reserve (POR). By investigating the efficacy of autologous stem cell therapy, it offers potential insights into a promising treatment avenue for a significant reproductive health concern. The findings, albeit preliminary, contribute to the evolving landscape of reproductive medicine and highlight the need for further research in this area to validate and refine the therapeutic approach.</p> <p>Answer 2: The title "Autologous Stem Cell Therapy for Poor Ovarian Reserve: A Prospective Observational Study" is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the research. However, if a more captivating or concise title is desired, an alternative could be "Revitalizing Ovarian Function: Autologous Stem Cell Therapy in Poor Ovarian Reserve – A Prospective Study."</p> <p>Answer 3: Yes, the abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study's aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. It includes relevant information such as the study population, intervention, outcome measures, and key findings, giving readers a clear understanding of the research conducted and its implications.</p> <p>Answer 4: it appears that the manuscript follows a logical structure with clear subsections such as Aims, Study Design, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion. This organization helps readers navigate through the content and understand the study's objectives, methods, findings, and implications.</p> <p>Answer 5: Need to describe name of scientific testing on the foot note of table.</p> <p>Answer 6: It's okay. However, additional reference will enrich the manuscript.</p>	
<p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> <p>Quite acceptable. Few grammatical correction need to revised.</p>		
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:	Munama Magdum
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Preventive and Social Medicine, Bangladesh