

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_122722</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Navigating Digital Health Technology: A Comprehensive Review of USFDA Regulations</b>
Type of the Article	

**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 presents a critical and timely examination of the intersection between digital health technology and regulatory frameworks, specifically focusing on USFDA guidelines. It contributes significantly to the scientific community by providing an in-depth analysis of the regulatory challenges and opportunities in this rapidly evolving field. The manuscript not only addresses current issues but also sets the stage for future discourse on digital health innovation. This work is particularly valuable as it highlights the importance of regulatory compliance in ensuring the safety and efficacy of digital health solutions, thus advancing the overall field of healthcare technology.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title "Navigating Digital Health Technology: A Comprehensive Review of USFDA Regulations" is highly appropriate, effectively encapsulating the scope and focus of the manuscript. It succinctly conveys the essence of the work, which is essential for attracting the attention of researchers and practitioners interested in the regulatory aspects of digital health technologies.</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 is well-constructed and offers a concise yet comprehensive summary of the manuscript. It effectively outlines the key regulatory challenges, the significance of digital health technologies, and the potential implications for healthcare. To enhance the abstract's depth, I recommend including a brief mention of future trends and the evolving landscape of digital health, which would provide readers with a more forward-looking perspective.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with clearly defined subsections that logically flow from one topic to the next. The organization supports a coherent narrative that guides the reader through complex regulatory frameworks and technological advancements. The structure effectively facilitates a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter, making the manuscript accessible to a wide range of readers, from regulatory professionals to academic researchers.</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 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates a high level of scientific rigor, with well-supported arguments and thorough analysis of regulatory frameworks. It successfully balances technical detail with broader implications, making it both scientifically robust and practically relevant. The discussion of challenges such as data privacy, interoperability, and clinical validation is particularly strong, reflecting a deep understanding of both the technological and regulatory landscapes. The integration of case studies or examples could further enrich the discussion and provide practical insights into the real-world application of these technologies.</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>The references are comprehensive, up-to-date, and relevant to the field of digital health technology. They reflect the current state of research and regulatory developments, thereby reinforcing the manuscript's credibility. While the reference list is robust, ongoing updates with the latest literature as the field evolves will be important to maintain the manuscript's relevance.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, precise, and appropriate for the target audience. However, minor grammatical revisions and stylistic refinements could further improve the manuscript's readability and ensure that it meets the highest standards of academic writing.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, this manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field of digital health technology. It is well-researched, thoroughly analyzed, and effectively communicates the complexities of navigating USFDA regulations. The addition of a section on future trends and emerging technologies would provide a more forward-looking perspective, further enhancing the manuscript's impact and relevance. Additionally, considering real-world case studies could offer practical insights that would benefit both researchers and practitioners.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Yasir Awad Ahmed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Saudi Arabia</b>