

**Chromosomal abnormalities in women with primary and secondary amenorrhea**Ahmed TB *et al.* (ahmedtussy@gmail.com)**Technical review****Round 1**

<b>Reviewer A information</b>			
Date review assigned	9-Mar-2024	Date review completed	16-Mar-2024
Reviewer name	A	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	-	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	No
<b>Reviewer's comments (18-Mar-24)</b>		<b>Author's response (12-May-24)</b> [Please write a response to each point. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers. Write response if score is less than 6]	
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	6	-	
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	4	The manuscript has been revised according to the scholarly manner.	
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	6	-	
Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	8	-	
<p>a. Overview of the manuscript:</p> <p>The paper provides a valuable exploration of chromosomal abnormalities in case of amenorrhea in Bangladesh. However, in my opinion, there are certain areas that require refinement to elevate its scholarly standard.</p> <p>b. Major Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the results section (lines 171-179): It would enhance the paper to compare the findings with those of other studies or different ethnic groups.</li> <li>In the discussion section (lines 181-265): The discussion should be structured for consistency, with each paragraph focusing on a single topic to improve comprehension.</li> </ol> <p>c. Minor Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In line 68 of the abstract, the abbreviation "DSD" should be clarified with its full meaning.</li> <li>Regarding the second highlight in line 84, stating that there is no available data on chromosomal abnormalities in primary and secondary amenorrhea among Bangladeshi women contradicts the information provided in the paper by Forhad QE, Tansim S, and Begum A. "Primary amenorrhoea: analysis of 44 cases" (Bangladesh J Obstet Gynaecol. 2008;23(2):46-50). Correction is needed accordingly.</li> </ol>		<p>b. Major Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comparison of the findings with those of other studies or ethnic groups are mentioned in discussion section (Line: 190-247).</li> <li>The discussion was structured with individual paragraphs focusing on a single topic (Line: 190-276).</li> </ol> <p>c. Minor Points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The full meaning of DSD was mentioned in the abstract (Line: 68).</li> <li>Highlight no.2 was rewritten (Line: 84-85).</li> </ol>	

<p>3. In line 121 of the introduction, when referring to the percentage of amenorrhea, clarification is needed regarding the country to which the percentage pertains.</p> <p>4. In the introduction (lines 110-126), considering the multitude of prior studies conducted, the rationale for conducting the current study should be consistently explained.</p> <p>5. In lines 138-159 of the karyotyping section: In line 159, the cytovision platform used should be specified (imaging Biosystem).</p> <p>The authors should indicate which Human cytogenetic nomenclature was utilized (e.g., 2016). The number of metaphases analyzed for each patient or any extended method used in the detection of chromosomal abnormalities should be mentioned; if not applicable, the authors should acknowledge this as a limitation.</p> <p>6. In line 169, since "Institutional Review Board (IRB)" is mentioned once, the abbreviated form "(IRB)" may not be necessary.</p> <p>7. In lines 208, 213, and 258 of the discussion, where the authors mention "Figure number," it would be more appropriate to refer to figures in the results section.</p>	<p>3. Clarification of country name (Turkey) regarding the mentioned percentage of amenorrhea was done (Line: 126).</p> <p>4. Consistent explanation of rationale was done with the reviewer's feedback (Line: 111-127).</p> <p>5. The Cytovision platform (Imaging biosystem) was mentioned (Line: 167).</p> <p>Mentioned the name of Human cytogenetic nomenclature was utilized (Line: 165).</p> <p>The number of metaphases analyzed for each patient was mentioned (Line: 165).</p> <p>6. Omitted the abbreviated form "IRB" (Line: 177).</p> <p>7. Mentioned the "Figure number" in the results section and removed it from the discussion section (Line: 183-185).</p>
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	Revisions Required

<b>Reviewer B information</b>			
Date review assigned	9-Mar-2024	Date review completed	17-Mar-2024
Reviewer name	Marium Salwa	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	0000-0001-7869-3343	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes
<b>Reviewer's comments (18-Mar-24)</b>		<b>Author's response (12-May-24)</b>	
		[Please write a response to each point. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers. Write response if score is less than 6]	
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	7	-	
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	6	-	
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	6	-	
Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	9	-	
The manuscript explores an important topic within the Bangladeshi context, but its focus solely on karyotype frequency distribution limits its appeal.			
<p>1. There's potential to enhance the study by integrating and correlating patients' physical findings with karyotypic abnormalities.</p> <p>2. The authors mention that this study holds potential for improving patient management and counseling but fail to elaborate on how the data supports this.</p>		<p>1. Integrating and correlating patient's physical findings with karyotypic abnormalities were done (Line: 263-272).</p> <p>2. How data support to improve the patient management and counselling was elaborated (Line: 127-130, Line: 281-282).</p>	

3. The manuscript needs grammatical and language editing.	3. Grammatical and language editing was done with the reviewer's feedback.
4. Uniform and appropriate in-text citations should be ensured.	4. Uniform and appropriate in-text citation was done with the reviewer's feedback (Line: 114-126, Line: 142, Line:191-263).
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	Revisions Required

<b>Responsible Editor's comments (26-Apr-24)</b>		<b>Author's response (12-May-24)</b>	
Name	Md Maruf Haque Khan	[Please write a response to each point. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
ORCID	0000-0001-8014-9638		
1. Limit the number of tables to six, including figures.	1. Limited the number of tables to six, including figures.	2. Remove % symbol from table 1 & 2.	2. Removed % symbol from table 1 & 2.
2. Ensure all details of reference 16 are accurately cited.	2. Removed the previous reference 16. Added new reference with accurate citation (Line: 224, Line: 348-350).	3. Ensure all details of reference 16 are accurately cited.	3. Removed the previous reference 16. Added new reference with accurate citation (Line: 224, Line: 348-350).
<b>Handling Editor's Decision</b>	Revisions Required		

### Round 2

<b>Reviewer A information</b>			
Date review assigned	9-Mar-2024	Date review completed	16-Mar-2024
Reviewer name	A	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	-	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	No
<b>Reviewer's recommendation (26-Apr-24)</b>	<b>Accept Submission</b>		

<b>Responsible Editor's comments (26-Apr-24)</b>		<b>Author's response (12-May-24)</b>	
Name	Md Maruf Haque Khan	[Please write a response to each point. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
ORCID	0000-0001-8014-9638		
<b>Final Editorial Decision (6-May-24)</b>		<b>ACCEPT</b>	