

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82126
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE AWARENESS AND PERCEPTION ON COMORBIDITIES OF OBESITY AMONG DENTAL STUDENTS- A SURVEY
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In any abstract main highlights are results and methods. You have given very less information about both methods and results, and too much content in Introduction. 2. More information needed about participants. What was your study design? Statistical tools used? 3. What is your conclusion? <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. This study focusses on comorbidities of obesity not management of obesity (Refer manuscript for the comments) 5. Very poorly written Introduction. There are many irrelevant sentences. 6. Language is not up to mark. Formatting is not proper. 7. Authors are suggested to consult Native English speakers to write manuscript. 8. Entire introduction is written in one single paragraph, which makes it very difficult to review this manuscript. 9. Content in the introduction is not presented in coherent manner and flow is missing. 10. I am surprised too see authors did not mention anything about aims and objectives of study? 11. They did not provide any rationale to their study. 12. Why they conducted this study, what is the significance? 13. No review studies were presented, gap in existing knowledge was not addressed <p>Methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Please elaborate your methods. Add more information about participants characteristics. What is age range, gender, ethnicity and any other relevant information about participants? 15. What is sampling procedure? How did you select sample? Is there any inclusion or exclusion criteria? 16. To how many students you have send the survey? 17. Have taken informed consent from the sample? 18. Is your study ethically approve? 19. What is the ethical approval code? 20. How did you select the questionnaire? What is the reference to your questionnaire? On what basis you select this questionnaire? 21. How did you check the validity? 22. What is the validity and reliability of the questionnaire used? <p>Results and Discussions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 23. Too many figures (9) 24. Present your data in table 25. Characteristics of participants not given 26. You have not mentioned about gender in method section, from where gender appears in the results? 27. What is prenatal depression? From where this word came. In your questionnaire you have asked about (respiratory problem, diabetes, immunity, sleep apnea and covid 19). 28. This is factually wrong statement given by in the context of your study and results (refer my comments in the manuscript). You haven't asked any question about depression in your study, as evident from your results. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>29. Is it really 100? The number of participants? In method section 105 students responded to survey.</p> <p>30. In discussion, there is just the repetition of text an information already given in results (refer to manuscript)</p> <p>Conclusions:</p> <p>31. Is this the conclusion of your study? You did not do any study on this aspect of obesity. Conclusions are outcome of your results and research.</p> <p>32. Again, this not the part of study, did you conduct any research on the management of obesity? Certainly not, then from this conclusion arrived? conclusion from your study is required. (refer manuscript)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This study is not scientifically and technically up to mark. It lacks basic methodology to conduct a research. No clear presentation of methods, no objectives mentioned, Results are not properly stated, no discussion or interpretation of results, conclusions are not derived from the results of the study. Very careless approach taken by researcher. No formatting, lost of spelling mistake, language not proper.</p> <p>Conclusion, findings and methodology does not relate to each other.</p> <p>Please refer to the manuscript for more specific comments.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes Ethical approval not taken. No written informed consent taken from participant.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Tomar
Department, University & Country	King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Saudi Arabia