

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126434
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of net benefits of a therapy: A multi-regression mathematical model
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into [topic area], addressing a gap yet to be thoroughly explored in the scientific community. The findings are poised to advance understanding in this field and could be particularly useful for future research or practical applications. The methodological approach is rigorous and appropriately tailored to the research questions, adding credibility to the results. However, minor revisions could further clarify certain points and strengthen the paper.	Agreed, minor correction is done.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title accurately reflects the study's focus and key elements. Alternatively, "A Detailed Analysis of ..." might enhance clarity if further precision is needed.	Based on comment of both reviewer a revised title is given
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 generally effectively covers the study's objectives, methods, key findings, and conclusions. However, including a specific sentence on the potential implications or applications of the findings could improve its impact and make the abstract more informative for readers.	Comment is correct, line added.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections follow a logical structure that enhances readability and flow.	Comment is correct, hence no author feedback is required.
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 study demonstrates scientific robustness through its well-defined research design and careful data analysis. Furthermore, the authors address potential limitations transparently, adding to the manuscript's credibility. Minor suggestions for further clarity in the methodology section would make it even stronger.	The other reviewer opined that the methodology is appropriate, further addition may not contribute much, hence not changed this part
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and recent, covering essential background and related research.	Comment is correct, hence no author feedback is required.
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, the language is suitable for scholarly communication. A few sections could benefit from minor language editing to improve clarity,	No author feedback is required
Optional/General comments	This is a well-structured manuscript that contributes meaningfully to the field. Minor improvements in the clarity of the discussion points could enhance its impact further.	No author feedback is required

Review Form 3

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)	