

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_104802
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of nutritional interventions on epigenetic influences in the gestational and puerperium period: a systematic review
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1.The manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community as it addresses the impact of nutritional interventions on epigenetic influences during the gestational and postpartum periods. Understanding the role of nutrition in epigenetics can have significant implications for fetal development and long-term health outcomes.</p> <p>2. The title "Impact of nutritional interventions on epigenetic influences in the gestational and puerperium period: a systematic review" is appropriate as it clearly reflects the focus and scope of the study.</p> <p>3.The abstract provides a good overview of the study, its background, aims, methodology, and key findings. It effectively summarizes the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>4.Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are well-organized and align with the standard format for a systematic review.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound, and the selected studies support the claims and conclusions presented.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and relevant to the topic. However, I suggest adding a few more recent studies (published after 2021) to ensure the latest research findings are included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, I noticed a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved. I recommend a thorough proofreading and language editing to enhance the manuscript's clarity and readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the impact of nutrition on epigenetic mechanisms during pregnancy and postpartum. With some minor revisions to improve language quality and the addition of more recent references, this study will be a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manjiri Ranade-Mudgalkar
Department, University & Country	Prathima Institute of Medical Sciences, India