

### Review Form 3

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

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Summary: This manuscript addresses the critical issue of public health infodemics, focusing on strategies to combat misinformation and promote accurate health information. The paper provides a comprehensive overview of the infodemic problem, its impacts, and potential solutions. It covers key areas such as public education, communication strategies, collaboration with social media platforms, fostering public trust, and fact-checking. The manuscript is well-structured and draws on a wide range of relevant literature.</p> <p>Major issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction could benefit from a clearer definition of "infodemic" and a more focused thesis statement outlining the paper's main arguments.</li> <li>2. Some sections, particularly those on education and communication strategies, could be more tightly organized to avoid repetition and enhance clarity.</li> <li>3. The conclusion section could be strengthened by providing more specific recommendations or a synthesis of the key strategies discussed.</li> </ol> <p>Minor issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that should be addressed to improve readability.</li> <li>2. Some paragraphs are overly long and could be broken up for better clarity and flow.</li> <li>3. The use of in-text citations is inconsistent, with some using parenthetical citations and others using footnote-style numbers.</li> </ol> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>The manuscript offers a comprehensive examination of the public health infodemic issue, providing valuable insights into potential solutions. The authors have done a commendable job in covering the breadth of the topic, from defining the problem to exploring various strategies for combating misinformation. The inclusion of case studies and examples strengthens the arguments presented, grounding the discussion in real-world contexts. This approach helps readers understand the practical implications of the strategies discussed.</p> <p>However, there are several areas where the manuscript could be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Visual aids: The paper would benefit from the inclusion of figures or tables to illustrate key points or data. Visual representations can enhance reader understanding and break up the text, making the content more engaging and accessible.</li> <li>2. Methodology: While this is a review article rather than an empirical study, it would be helpful to explicitly state the approach used for literature review and analysis. This would enhance the paper's rigor and allow readers to better evaluate the comprehensiveness of the review.</li> <li>3. Literature selection: Consider adopting a more systematic approach to literature selection and analysis. This could involve clearly stating the criteria for including studies, the databases searched, and the time frame considered. Such an approach would strengthen the paper's methodological foundation.</li> <li>4. Evidence support: While the conclusions drawn are generally well-supported by the literature reviewed, some claims could benefit from additional evidence. Ensure that each major point is backed by sufficient references to scholarly sources.</li> <li>5. References: The reference list appears comprehensive, which is a strength of the paper. However, it's crucial to double-check that all in-text citations are properly included in the reference list to maintain academic integrity.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>6. Title: The current title, "LEVERAGING THE FIGHT AGAINST PUBLIC HEALTH INFODEMIC," is informative but could be more specific. Consider revising it to reflect the paper's focus on strategies and solutions. For example: "Strategies for Combating Public Health Infodemics: A Comprehensive Review."</p> <p>Overall, this manuscript provides a valuable contribution to the understanding of public health infodemics and strategies to combat them. With some revisions to address the points mentioned above, it has the potential to be a strong addition to the literature on this important topic.</p> <p>To further improve the paper, consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tightening the organization of sections to reduce repetition and enhance clarity</li> <li>• Breaking up long paragraphs for better readability</li> <li>• Addressing grammatical errors and awkward phrasings</li> <li>• Ensuring consistency in citation style throughout the paper</li> <li>• Strengthening the conclusion with more specific recommendations or a clear synthesis of key strategies</li> </ul> <p>By addressing these points, you can enhance the impact and clarity of your valuable work on this critical public health issue.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Julian Yin V. Borges</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brazil</b>