

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_128469
Title of the Manuscript:	A systematic review of the obesity literature
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript on "A Systematic Review of the Obesity Literature" is important for the scientific community. It brings together existing research to explain the causes, health effects, and possible solutions for obesity. The review points out gaps in current knowledge, highlights new trends, and provides useful insights for future research and health policies. This information can help doctors, researchers, and policymakers create better ways to prevent and treat obesity, which is a serious health problem worldwide.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "A Systematic Review of the Obesity Literature" is clear but could be more specific. Here are some concise alternatives: "A Systematic Review of Obesity: Causes, Impacts, and Interventions" "Obesity Research: A Systematic Review of Key Insights and Evidence" "Tackling Obesity: A Review of Causes, Consequences, and Solutions"	
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 covers essential aspects of obesity. Deletions and Edits COVID-19 Link: While relevant, this could be shortened or reframed to emphasize the broader vulnerability of people with obesity to infectious diseases. Weight Loss Industry: This section feels disjointed from the main discussion. If the review specifically analyzes this industry, provide more context. Otherwise, it may be better to remove it.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct but requires minor revisions for clarity, precision, and alignment with global health standards. Key corrections include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update the BMI definition to reflect WHO's standard (BMI ≥ 25 for overweight, BMI ≥ 30 for obesity). Clarify the role of the "weight loss industry" or remove it if not central to the manuscript's objectives. Consider referencing specific anti-obesity drugs and their mechanisms for better scientific depth. These adjustments will enhance the manuscript's accuracy, comprehensiveness, and impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes sufficient references	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is understandable but requires refinement to meet scholarly communication standards. Enhancing academic tone, improving sentence flow, citing evidence, and using more precise scientific terminology will increase its impact and credibility.	
Optional/General comments	the manuscript is well-structured but could be strengthened by refining its methodology, expanding the scope, improving language, and providing more precise references and data.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V.Bhavani
Department, University & Country	ESIC Medical College and Hospital, India