

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_94569
Title of the Manuscript:	“THE INFLUENCES OF COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON EATING BEHAVIORS: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURES”
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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>This manuscript has major flaws in the Methodology section, Results, Conclusion and References as well. It needs English translation improvements. I made corrections and remarks in yellow in the manuscript. The first study design and methods need more specific data about the methods and tools used to choose the articles for the systematic review. Why in the Conclusion part the authors said they chose low-quality papers when even from the start they found 850 articles and then reduced it to 76 and again to 40? The Conclusion is not properly written, with no connections to Aim and Title, and mentioning the low-quality database used is improper. The References are too long, for a systematic review you have to use only the articles chosen for it, then no more than 40-42 articles, not 82. It needs another study design (focused on symptoms or on behaviors, either on Eating Disorders or Disordered Eating, not both), Methods to be used, statistics to describe the results compared, a proper Conclusion, and good References. Please add a table with the main articles from which you extracted the conclusion, comparing data etc. like in a proper systematic review.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Monica Tarcea
Department, University & Country	G. E. Palade University of Medicine, Pharmacy, Science and Technology, Romania