ReviewForm3

JournalName:	**JournalofAdvancesinMedicineandMedicalResearch**
ManuscriptNumber:	**Ms_JAMMR_126852**
TitleoftheManuscript:	**Thefourdifferentanabolicscenarios:apotentialmandatorydistinctionforresearchandclinicalpractice**
TypeoftheArticle	**OpinionArticle**

ReviewForm3

PART1:ReviewComments

CompulsoryREVISIONcomments	**Reviewer'scomment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance ofthismanuscriptforthescientificcommunity.Whydo youlike(ordislike)thismanuscript? Aminimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**Themanuscriptconsistsoftotal10pages,includingthelistoftotal24literaturereferences.TheAuthors in theirnarrativereviewcommentaryoutline4possiblescenariosoftestosteroneand/orandrogen substances administration to humans, outlining their pros and cons and remarking ethical and legal issues that arise in each scenario. As such, the article is likely to raise interest in the Readers and adds original input into thestatusofknowledgeintherespectivediscipline. However,theAuthorsopenthethisfarunquestionably closedgatetodiscussionconcerningmakingitacceptableusingtestosteroneand/orandrogensubst ancesin casesthathavenostrict medicalindication,likeaestheticsor performancedoping - thatthisfararerather univocally banned by the medical community. In contrast to the primum non nocere stand represented by the medical community, the Authors point at - questionable - benefits that may have resulted from testosterone and/or androgen substances treatments in healthy individuals, often applied in doses much higher than registered to be used in medicine. The Authors divide this phenomenon into "controlled" use of certain substances of known quality and "uncontrolled" use of unknown substances of questionable quality. In fact, as far as the legal system is concerned, there is in fact no difference between these scenarios. It is debatable whether it is ethically allowed to use and refer to the results of the experimental studies that were performed without medical need exposing the healthy participants to the possible health risks of overdosing the substances, even though the Authors argue that if controlled doses of controlled kindofsubstances are administered, suchnegativeeffects,especiallyoflastingnature, werenotdetected. I would suggest the Authors to stress more clearly in the text that currently in most countries the use of testosterone and/or androgen substances purely for aesthetic effect or performance improvement in otherwise healthy individuals (without medical indications) is associated with serious ethical and legal risks,inordertowarnmedicalprofessionalsnottoengageinsuchdubiousactivities.**	
Isthetitleofthearticlesuitable? (Ifnotpleasesuggestanalternativetitle)	**No,titleisnotclearenough -atitlelike"Possiblescenariosoftestosteroneandanabolicandrogenic steroids use in and outside medicine" would be more appropriate.**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggesttheaddition(ordeletion)ofsomepointsinthis section? Please write your suggestions here.	**Yes-theabstractmirrorsthekey thesespresentedbytheAuthorsinthemaintext.**	
Aresubsectionsandstructureofthemanuscript appropriate?	**Yes-thestructureorthemanuscriptislogical.**	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctnessofthismanuscript.Whydoyouthinkthat thismanuscriptisscientificallyrobustandtechnical ly sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**ThelineofargumentationpresentedbytheAuthorsisclearenough.Itiseasytofollow astheAuthors dividedthetextintopartsreferringtovariousscenariostheydiscuss.TheAuthorspresenttheirthe ses using the scientific, objective approach.**	
Arethereferencessufficientandrecent?Ifyouhave suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**The literature references are numerous, most of them reasonably recent. However, there are some superannuated,e.c.stemmingfrom1976, anditwouldbereasonabletofindsomeneweronesintheir place.**	
- MinorREVISIONcomments **Isthelanguage/Englishqualityofthearticlesuitable for scholarly communications?**	**Allabbreviationsshallbeexplainedwhileusedforthefirsttimeinthetext,e.c.PEDs.Theoverallquality of English language used is good, the style is objective, suitable for a scientific paper.**	

ReviewForm3

Optional/Generalcomments		

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Robert Suslo**
Department, University & Country	**Wroclaw Medical University, Poland**