

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126852
Title of the Manuscript:	The four different anabolic scenarios: a potential mandatory distinction for research and clinical practice
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article has a clear message . Which warrant a clear distinction between these scenarios and the rational use of these hormones. It could enhance academic and clinical discourse, leading to more precise recommendations. Future prospective study will help to draw more precise conclusion in this context.	Dear Reviewer, I would like to thank you for the time invested in reviewing this manuscript and for your valuable insights.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the article is not suitable one. Suggested Title: Use of anabolic in different scenarios: warrant a potential mandatory distinction for research and clinical practice	The title, suggested by other reviewer as mora accurate was accepted. "Possible scenarios of testosterone and anabolic androgenic steroids use in and outside medicine" If it is acceptable, of course, in your evaluation.
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.	The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive but still could be more	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It is fair	
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.	The scenario based discussion is the main base of this article. But it would be better if there is more renown national and international guideline based discussion is there in this four context. Simultaneously true indication and absolute contraindication of these hormones should be added with appropriate reference. Add a recommendation section. Add few more study based outcome could be added on favour or against of irrational or judicial use of these hormones.	Dear Reviewer, The primary goal of this discussion is simply to distinguish the scenarios of testosterone and anabolic steroid use, both within and outside the medical context. The purpose is to enrich academic discourse by generating new insights or solutions on a topic that is often considered forbidden or taboo. At no point was there an intent to recommend or oppose usage in any scenario. Therefore, to detail the indications and contraindications of each different anabolic steroid studied for various contexts (focused on therapeutic uses in specific diseases) as though considering "medical prescription" or "recommendation of use" would exceed the text length and reference limits established by the journal and, again, diverge from the manuscript's purpose. Each anabolic steroid has some variation in its indications and contraindications, and there are no guidelines or official positions—academic or from medical societies—that specifically address this topic with such detailed specifications. The manuscript's purpose was not to authorize, defend, contraindicate, or prohibit use, but rather to discuss that usage and outcomes should be considered in light of different scenarios, as these are distinct situations despite involving the same class of drugs. Thus, advocating for or against usage falls outside the manuscript's

Review Form 3

		<p>scope, which aimed to discuss various scenarios (enhancing the academic value of these discussions) that should be considered when evaluating the purposes of use and both positive and negative outcomes.</p> <p>Finally, the necessary precautions regarding what was written, in an effort to prevent misunderstandings, have been made (especially in the third scenario), emphasizing that medical organizations do not recommend such use and that any physician who engages in it may be subject to legal and ethical violations, in addition to potentially increasing health risks.</p> <p>I hope we can foster an enrichment of academic discussions and medical practice regarding this highly controversial topic</p> <p>Best Regards</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please add some more evidence based study references	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is fair	
Optional/General comments	The article could be accepted after minor revision.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	