

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78397
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence of Erectile dysfunction in patients of diabetes mellitus
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First line: replace the acronym "ED" to "Erectile dysfunction". 2. Rewrite: "Consecutive patients" - > 184 patients... were recruited... 3. "The prevalence of erectile dysfunction was 32.21%. The mean age in patients with erectile dysfunction was significantly high (58.40±10.96 years) compared to those without erectile dysfunction (51.00±11.16 years) (p<0.001)": This paragraph is in the wrong place. Author(s) can delete it or better allocate it in the abstract. <p>Text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Second line of the Introduction: Correct the quotation marks for the word "impotence". 2. Authors should check this data in more recent articles. A brief search on Google Scholar using the terminology "diabetes" AND "erectile dysfunction" AND "prevalence" showed a vast scientific production, including systematic review and overview. 3. "So far, only a few research have been conducted to determine the frequency and prevalence of this syndrome in diabetic individuals. In addition, epidemiological data on the majority of ED in diabetics is limited. [7]": The author(s) should provide more recently datas. Just one bibliography used has than ten years. 4. It is possible to see throughout the text, including the Abstract, some errors considered major, perhaps due to the authors' lack of re-reading the text and correcting it. There are paragraphs that are pasted in the wrong places. For example, "The body mass index (BMI) was calculated. Blood sugar (fasting and postprandial), HbA1c, lipid profile (serum triglyceride [TG], low-density lipoprotein [LDL], very low-density lipoprotein [VLDL], high-density lipoprotein [HDL]), blood urea, serum creatinine, serum bilirubin, SGOT, and SGPT were all measured. [8] 5. "The subject's arterial blood pressure was taken three times at the end of the physical examination while he was seated.": the author(s) should provide more information about it. 6. Methodology: What about the inclusion criteria? 7. The following criterion will be utilized to make metabolic syndrome diagnosis for men: correct the past tense. 8. In the current study, we discovered a significant relationship between the prevalence of severe ED and the participant's age: The authors should discuss how age can be a confounding factor. It seems to me that age-related factors may be influencing the ED in the participants, not just the presence of diabetes. Are there others studies that show the same result? 9. "Depression is more common among diabetic patients than in the general population, according to research": the author(s) do not provide any data on how this information relates to the present study. Was depression measured? 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>It is nice say the aim of the study in this topic</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>It will be nice if the author(s) reading careful and rewrite the text, enhancing the connection between paragraphs.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Andreza Conceição de Souza Tavares
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Brazil