

### 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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it tackles the pressing issue of infodemics, which can undermine public health efforts by spreading misinformation and disinformation. The emphasis on raising awareness and proposing balanced solutions is crucial in today's digital age, where information is rapidly disseminated and often unverified. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on promoting accurate, evidence-based information, as this is essential for maintaining public trust in health interventions. However, the abstract could benefit from more specific details regarding the proposed solutions to enhance its practical relevance.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title "LEVERAGING THE FIGHT AGAINST PUBLIC HEALTH INFODEMIC" is somewhat suitable as it conveys the focus on combating the infodemic. However, it could be made clearer and more specific to better reflect the manuscript's emphasis on both combating misinformation and promoting accurate information. An alternative title could be:</p> <p>"Combating Public Health Infodemics: Strategies for Misinformation Control and Evidence-Based Communication".</p> <p>This title highlights both the challenge (infodemics) and the dual approach of misinformation control and evidence-based communication.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract provides a general overview of the manuscript's objectives, but it lacks specific details that would make it more comprehensive and informative for the reader. Here are some suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specify the Scope of the Infodemic: The abstract could benefit from mentioning the types of public health issues or scenarios where misinformation has had a significant impact (e.g., pandemics, vaccination campaigns).</li> <li>2. Detail Proposed Solutions: The abstract briefly mentions "balanced solutions" but does not specify what these are. Including a brief description of the proposed strategies or approaches would make the abstract more informative.</li> <li>3. Clarify the Methodology: If the manuscript involves a particular methodology or framework for addressing the infodemic, this should be briefly mentioned in the abstract.</li> <li>4. Impact Statement: Adding a sentence that highlights the expected impact of the manuscript's findings on public health practice or policy could strengthen the abstract.</li> </ol> <p>Revised Abstract Suggestion:</p> <p>"This manuscript addresses the critical need to combat the public health infodemic, which has the potential to undermine health interventions through the spread of misinformation and disinformation. It focuses on key areas where misinformation is most prevalent and proposes evidence-based strategies to counteract these threats. The manuscript outlines a multifaceted approach, including media literacy education, enhanced public communication strategies, and policy recommendations aimed at promoting accurate, reliable health information. By providing these solutions, this work aims to enhance public trust and improve the effectiveness of health communication efforts."</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>- O k</p>	
<p><b>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</b></p>	<p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound as it addresses a well-defined problem in public health—the infodemic—using a comprehensive approach. The focus on evidence-based strategies suggests that the authors have grounded their recommendations in scientific literature and best practices, which is essential for credibility in this field. Additionally, by proposing actionable</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>solutions, the manuscript goes beyond theoretical discussion, indicating that the authors have considered the practical application of their work. The use of terms such as "misinformation" and "disinformation" is appropriate and reflects an understanding of the nuanced challenges involved in public health communication. However, a thorough review of the methodology and sources cited will be necessary to fully confirm its scientific rigor.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>- ok</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>- ok</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Pedro Henrique Silva de Rossi</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>UNESP Campus de Botucatu, Brazil</b></p>