



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_63446
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of trace elemental composition, sex hormones and antioxidant capacity of young women with menstrual irregularities
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract of the paper was clearly reflective of the title. The researchers adequately espoused their assessment of relationship between menstrual irregularities among the subjects and trace elemental composition, sex hormones and antioxidant capacity. 2. Introduction of the paper was very comprehensive, citing relevant literature to support the purpose and relevance of the study. However, the linkage between stress and role of antioxidants, as expressed by the author, could be clarified further. 3. Materials and methods used by the researcher was appropriate. Sourcing research subjects from the most populous city for such a technical study provides a fair opportunity to achieve study objectives. The number of subjects for the control was the same as the subjects with various menstrual irregularities. 4. The researcher adequately informed the subjects about the purpose of the study in their own language before making each of them sign informed consent. The researcher also secure ethical clearance and approval before embarking on the procedures. 5. Results and discussion were in detail and reflected the outcome of the study. 6. The paper has not been published in any journal, thus, demonstrating originality of research work. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There were a few typographical errors which need to be corrected in the attached manuscript. 2. References need to be arranged in alphabetical order and reflect in the text. 	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abraham Attoh
Department, University & Country	Akenten Appiah-Menka University of Skills Training and Entrepreneurial Development, Ghana