

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_122616
Title of the Manuscript:	LEVERAGING THE FIGHT AGAINST PUBLIC HEALTH INFODEMIC
Type of the Article	Short communication

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The subject is of great importance in today's world. It should be discussed more and more, especially with the growth of technology, there is much more space for false information to spread. I personally like this subject and see many areas in this field which are necessary to be evaluated. This short communication has reviewed some points of this issue using recent references.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Although it is a general explanation it is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is very short. I believe it should be developed, and point to the main issues of the manuscript. The main subsections are expected to be named at least.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In communication papers, the author has more options for organizing the structure and it seems ok.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There should be storytelling in such types of papers. First, the language and then the sequence of the text in each subsection should be improved.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References seem to be all right. Doi of two of the references are not mentioned.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The text is not easy to follow. It should be more fluent. Also, there are punctuational mistakes in different parts. The language should be edited.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Amirmohammad Yavar
Department, University & Country	Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Iran