

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_129615
Title of the Manuscript:	Reduced Incidence of Behavioral Disorders in ADHD: A Comparative Study of Bupropion vs. Stimulants
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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The comparative study of bupropion vs. stimulants highlights the importance of addressing both ADHD symptoms and comorbid behavioural disorders, such as oppositional defiant disorder and mood dysregulation. Bupropion offers a non-stimulant alternative, reducing the risk of irritability and emotional dysregulation often associated with stimulants. This personalized approach enhances patient quality of life, minimizes long-term risks, and supports more effective management of ADHD and its comorbidities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article suitable.	
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.	Abstract of the article is okay	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is well-written and provides a clear overview of the study. However, certain sections, such as [specific section, e.g., "the introduction" or "discussion"], could benefit from a more detailed and scientifically rigorous explanation. For instance, elaborating on the underlying mechanisms of action for bupropion and stimulants in ADHD treatment would strengthen the scientific depth. Additionally, further discussion of the study's implications in clinical practice, supported by recent literature, could enhance the manuscript's impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Author has given 32 references for aforementioned manuscript. However the references reflects that they are very old (2,3,4 references) with respect to current scenario. Therefore it is recommended that author may used some latest references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Okay	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Mansi Verma</u>
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	<u>MIET, MEERUT, INDIA</u>