

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_101940
Title of the Manuscript:	Naturopathy Module in Management of Obesity (class-3); a case study
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes Research theme is interesting and informative too.</p> <p>2. Because different methods had been tried to control obesity i suggest it should be "Effect of different strategies for the management of Obesity"</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive but it should corrected according scientific write up</p> <p>4. All subsections are appropriate</p> <p>5. Scientifically it is correct but it should be technically sound by the inclusion of technical write up</p> <p>6. More recent references should be added</p> <p>It should be modified technically by improving write up ,by the inclusion of more references and by following the instructions as mentioned in the reviewed manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Its ok</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>No</p>	

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Naureen Naeem</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lahore Garrison University, Pakistan</b>