

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_110216
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Different Training Modalities on Metabolic Profile in Individuals with Metabolic Syndrome: A Comparative Analysis
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>Yes, As Metabolic syndrome is a major chronic degenerative disease moderate to intense physical activity can be an important treatment strategy. Therefore, it is important to determine the most effective training modalities for improving metabolic profile in individuals with metabolic syndrome. The findings of this research have important implications for public health. Combined aerobic and resistance training should be recommended as the first-line treatment for metabolic syndrome.</p> <p>Could be better- "The impact of different training modalities in metabolic profile of metabolic syndrome patients: A mini review" So that the reader can easily categorise the type of research.</p> <p>Yes, The abstract is designed well, meets the word limit and efficiently delivers the idea of the study and perfectly structured.</p> <p>Yes, sufficient</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current description of the research design as a "descriptive approach" is somewhat vague. It would be more helpful to explicitly state that the study is a systematic review of the literature. • While the conclusion acknowledges the mixed results of concurrent training, it could be further strengthened by discussing potential reasons for these inconsistencies, such as variations in training protocols or participant characteristics. • The conclusion could emphasize that the optimal training modality and intensity may vary depending on individual factors such as age, fitness level, and metabolic profile. <p>Yes.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Proofread carefully for typos and grammatical errors. For example, in the third paragraph, you say "The statistical analysis will provide a high degree of precision and enhance the validity of the research findings." This should be "The statistical analysis will aim to provide high precision and contribute to the validity of the research findings."</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Mahima Bharathi
Department, University & Country	Amrita Institute of Medical Sciences, India