

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78672
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of bone mineral density in males and females of various age group
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The aims and objectives are planned in such a broad scope that they cannot be analysed in a single study. There are serious problems in the methodology of the study. The study was conducted randomly with the bag dataset without determining the purpose/target correctly. The PICOS criteria should be considered when planning the study and presenting the study.</p> <p>Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be determined more carefully. Many variables such as steroid use, digestive system and urinary system diseases, physical activity status can seriously affect bone mineral density.</p> <p>Table 2 need not be given. Analysis with more important statistical methods should be given (MANOVA, correlation and even regression if prerequisites are met). Statistical methods are very limited.</p> <p>Appropriate analysis was not performed to find the relationship stated in the " In the present study we observed BMD of 200 study subjects . We distributed study subjects according to age groups and according to sex to find association between them ." statement.</p> <p>What is the meaning and importance of the table showing the difference between the age groups of men and women included in the study for this study? (Table 2) It should be checked whether these variables affect the QUS measurement results.</p> <p>Although Table 3 seems like a good table, we know that the age variable affects BMD significantly. If there is an age difference between men and women given in Table 2, this table contains incorrect results. You can analyse by fixing the age variable, or you can fix the age variable as a control variable in your new studies. If you do not control the influencing factors, the result you get may be erroneous and cause misinterpretation.</p> <p>The last paragraph of the discussion is irrelevant to the study.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abbreviations such as BMD should be clearly stated at the first occurrence and used in abbreviated form afterwards.</p> <p>Too many spelling and spelling errors. In this respect, the article should be carefully reviewed and revised.</p> <p>Appropriate references to the expression "So many other studies have proved that when males and females and children are compared for body size, differences in bone mass is observed to be disappeared or reduced." should be added.</p> <p>Appropriate references to the expression "There are few studies done on BMD . However, the proper data explaining the prevalence of osteoporosis among both men and women is scanty in developed as well as in developing countries." should be added.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>There are serious deficiencies in the emphasis of the importance of the study, its methodological planning, analysis, findings and discussion. There is a need for better planned studies on bone health, which is an important and current issue.</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> There are serious deficiencies in the planning and presentation of the study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oznur Başdas
Department, University & Country	Erciyes University, Turkey