

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82352
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative evaluation for the efficacy of collecting sample by using vaginal atrophy screening combistick (VAS combistick) as against the traditional method of collecting sample for screening of vaginal atrophy in perimenopausal women
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

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>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> : Genitals and sexuality is an essential element of health and happily aging in perimenopausal women with their partners. Vaginal atrophy (VA) of menopause is a condition associated to physiological, histological and anatomical changes noticed in the genital and urinary tracts in peri and postmenopausal women. Vaginal atrophy is the sequel of the decrease levels of estrogens in plasma, which are symptoms of menopause In this study we hypothesized that there vaginal sampling by vaginal atrophy screening (VAS) combistick will be better when compared to traditional method of sampling for screening of vaginal atrophy in terms of adequacy, feasibility and acceptability 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What updates can you write in this article? Fundamental reasons in the selection of the title of this study with supporting data New conclusions answer the level of effectiveness there have been no recommendations according to the results of the study 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Revised repairs on. Background. Discussion, reference and research methodology</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In this study we will be discussing the findings of feasibility and acceptability in self vaginal sampling by using vaginal atrophy screening (VAS) combistick and traditional method of sampling as well as adequacy of samples for vaginal atrophy in perimenopausal age group 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is necessary to look and look again at whether this research is completed or will take place. The results of the study have not answered specific specific objectives: data, methods, accuracy and feasibility of indicators such as The discussion has not compared with some research both nationally and internationally The reading list is very minimal once. The research procedure is clearly spelled out and the instruments used 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Neila Sulung
Department, University & Country	University of Fort De Kock, Indonesia