



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_13883
Title of the Manuscript:	Age-specific Serum Antimullerian Hormone Concentrations are Lower in Infertile Women AGE-
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	This is a good research work. It is publishable even though the result has not added any new knowledge. Title: The author(s) seems to have worked from an answer to a question. They have concluded their study before starting, judging by the title of the manuscript "Age-specific Serum Antimullerian Hormone Concentrations are lower in Infertile Women" how? So, this title is a conclusion of the research work. I suggest that the title may be improved upon to remove the impression of bias of what he was expecting the result to be. Let it be modified such as "The Age related Anti -Mullerian Hormone values among Infertile versus fertile women" Abstract: This should be rearranged in the manner generally acceptable in medical science research:- background, aims & objectives, patients and method, results and conclusion. The study is said to be a cohort, so what informed the sample size of 400 subjects? What determined the sample size? Line 36: The author has to be specific on what term or choice sub-heading to adopt 'materials and methods/.....etc make the work clumsy. Line 46: A detailed description of methods of sample collections ought to be given as this may even influence the results obtained.	1. The title has been changed as per the suggestion of the reviewer 2. We should be happy to rearrange the abstract headings, but we followed the Instruction to Authors. Editor, please advise. 3. The cohort selected were women undergoing IVF for treatment of infertility who were between the ages of 22 and 32 years. The Methods section has been changed to clarify this point. 4. We used the terminology given in the Instructions to Authors. Editor, please advise. 5. A description of method of sample collection has been added to the Methods section as per the suggestion of the reviewer. 6. The abbreviations have been eliminated as per the suggestion of the reviewer. 7. The references have been corrected as per the suggestion of the reviewer.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 84: the use of unexplained abbreviations in a text is not right such the use of PCOS Lines 111 – 148. The author should be consistent in his referencing style. References 4, 5, 6 and 13 are inconsistent with his adopted style. Reference number 7 has too many authors. When there are more than 6 authors to an article the first 4 are listed followed by et al	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 43: there is an omission of the word 'is' between hundred and two	And has been added as per the suggestion of the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I believe that the author having considered the above pointed out flaws can have the article published. ethical issues: The author is silent about the body that granted Ethical Clearance for the study. It is very important	Approval by the IRB has been added to the Methods section.