

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_123357</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EVALUATION OF SERUM ELECTROLYTES AMONG GERIATRIC AND NON-GERIATRIC MEN IN OSISOMA, ABA.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript is very much relevant as per today's perspective, but the selection of study participants does not feel to be appropriate. This study was carried out among healthy individuals especially in geriatrics that also with no comorbidities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the study is suitable for this article	
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.	Yes, the abstract finds to be comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	In methodology, under data collection mentioned about questionnaire. In the whole study no further results or use of the same has not mentioned. The purpose and contents of the questionnaire needs more clarity. In result part duplication of results was found (e.g. in Table one and two) only Table 2 is enough, similarly other tables too.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	More clarification in justification of results needed. References can be added.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it's understandable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The structured data collection form is misinterpreted as questionnaire and the domains were given under informed content and ethical consideration heading.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sreeja P A</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr. MGR Educational and Research Institute, India</b>