

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 comparison of Bupropion to stimulants both commonly used in ADHD management, offer valuable insights into safety and efficacy of non stimulant options for children and adolescents with ADHD at risk for behavioural issues. The study's use of large, de identified data from the TriNetX Global Health Research Network strengthens its relevance and applicability to diverse populations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be more clear to reflect the objective of the study. Alternative title suggestion: "Comparative Incidence of Oppositional Defiant and Conduct Disorders in ADHD: Bupropion vs. Stimulant Treatments"	
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, it is correct. However, it would be useful for the manuscript to discuss the limitations of using a retrospective cohort design which could introduce biases such as unmeasured confounders or incomplete data. Also, the ethical considerations could be briefly noted to provide complete transparency about study's methodology.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, however, there are occasional grammatical errors and phrasing that should be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	Minor revisions needed.	

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:	Ravjit Kaur
Department, University & Country	CT Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, India

Review Form 3