

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_91967
Title of the Manuscript:	Weight Change Before and After 30 Days of Intermittent Fasting Among University Students in Pakistan
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Its incomplete, not enough variables included in the study, no proper groups and samples are done, too old references, English to be improved, a lot of biases etc.</p> <p>It's not enough to evaluate the no of people by weight changes and to include it in BMI categories, it has to be followed the frequency of changes (gaining or losing weight) AND in what circumstances (if they changed only no of meals per day and the period between it it's not fasting. You said nothing about the no of calories from the diet, if they changed the type of food eaten (like avoiding meat), said nothing about exercises or other lifestyle changes during fasting, and said nothing about the other variables you said you used in the questionnaires.</p> <p>You have to improve the English translation, the methodology used, and the statistics to be stronger, also the references to be more recent.</p> <p>More important is to evaluate in detail the conditions of fasting (calories, food products changed from the menu, etc). Usually, after fasting, we are losing weight, not gaining, so what were the biases here...etc.</p> <p>Also, mark what is the originality of your study, and what it brings new for the other researchers.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Monica Tarcea
Department, University & Country	GE Palade University of Medicine, Romania