

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_118481
Title of the Manuscript:	The Intersection of Hepcidin and Polycystic Ovary Syndrome: A Review of Current Understanding
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. As PCOS is a disease with multifactorial health and reproductive problems causing much physical and psychological burden on young women, all possible pathologies must be explored and researched in order to formulate new treatment modalities. This manuscript serves to give the reader a quick understanding of the research findings related to iron metabolism in PCOS. The relationship of hyperandrogenism and hyper insulinism to iron overload and relative hepcidin deficiency demands further research.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is of my opinion that the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsection and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct as it agrees with the previous research.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent enough.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayesha Akhter
Department, University & Country	Shaheed Mansur Ali Medical College, Bangladesh