

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_96014
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Liraglutide on Weight Reduction & Metabolic Parameters in Patients living with Obesity With and Without Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus at Fujairah Hospital
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes it is. The research is very informative and educative Yes it is It is but some of the results are not consistent with what is in the full article The subsections are ok right to make so much conclusion on a retrospective study with so many lapses in the methodology. Many statements were not referenced, check the article and reference them The results presentation was very poor and not clear, just copied and paste from SPSS, no proper statistical tests done, repeated redundant tables, graphs and diagrams without proper interpretation	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok	
Optional/General comments	The researcher did a lot of work with so many information to pass across, however, the presentation of the methodology is not clear and the results also is poor	

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:	Maryam Shehu
Department, University & Country	Bingham University, Nigeria