

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJMAH_122452</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Epigenetic Mechanisms in Fetal Programming of Metabolic Syndrome.</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **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> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This is a very important review now that these epigenetic changes will come from the environment. And these changes occur rapidly? . Simply the environment, after repeated friction, changes the genetic material through epigenetics rapidly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Looking like a thesis, better formatted like a review paper.  Introduction, review of literature, discussion, your opinion, and conclusion	
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.	This is a narrative review author collected from the Milestone literature. But the author better to extract more and write his novel conclusion again.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes enough, but Vancouver style is preferable for medical articles.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ya but better to improve	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Keywords are better to be in alphabetical order in MeSH terms; they're better not to be in titles.  Try to concise the article.  Fetal programming: you can add molecular level	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>Rakesh kotha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Osmania Medical College, India</b>