

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_123357
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Serum Electrolytes Among Geriatric And Non-Geriatric Men In Osisoma, Aba.
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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant to the scientific community because it addresses a critical knowledge gap in general physiology – fluid & electrolyte balance and provides innovative insights that can inform future research directions. I appreciate the manuscript's clarity, organization, and thorough analysis, which make it a compelling read. However, I would have liked to see more discussion on demographic parameters like occupation and educational qualification between the groups to further enhance the manuscript's impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	To better understand the group, the author can include additional sociodemographic data, including occupation and educational qualification, to identify potential correlations with health outcomes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	To ensure transparency and replicability, it would have been beneficial for the author to include a master chart to facilitate verification of the statistical results. The author is requested to furnish the ethics committee approval form, which is essential for verifying that the study was reviewed and approved by an ethics committee. Discussion section is very short.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study adds value to existing literature. The author is requested to clarify the discrepancy in the SPSS software version used, as mentioned in the abstract (version 25) and methodology (version 21.0), to ensure accuracy and consistency.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but 3 outdated references were mentioned, which are not suggestable. Please ensure that all references are formatted in Vancouver style, as per the journal's guidelines, to maintain consistency and accuracy in citation.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall quality is fine.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Future studies should include female participants to improve generalizability.	

Review Form 3

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:	Lakshmi Sarapalli
Department, University & Country	Government Medical College, Vizianagaram, India