

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_130002 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Comparing Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD) Progression in Patients Treated with Lifestyle Intervention versus Pharmacotherapy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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 holds significant value for the scientific community as it addresses the critical and prevalent issue of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD). By comparing the efficacy of lifestyle interventions versus pharmacotherapy through a systematic review and meta-analysis, the study provides valuable insights into evidence-based strategies for managing NAFLD. The findings are particularly relevant for clinicians and researchers seeking to optimize therapeutic approaches for a condition with increasing global prevalence. Furthermore, the manuscript contributes to ongoing discussions in hepatology and metabolic disorders by highlighting the role of pharmacological agents alongside traditional lifestyle modifications. | Ok Thanks |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The current title is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and scope of the manuscript. However, for increased specificity, the following title could be considered: "Efficacy of Lifestyle Intervention Versus Pharmacotherapy in the Progression of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." | I have changed the title to the same as you suggested. |
| 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 is well-structured and provides a clear overview of the study. However, it could be improved by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Including specific numerical results from the meta-analysis to highlight key findings. Clarifying the implications of the findings for clinical practice. Briefly mentioning the primary pharmacotherapy agents analyzed (e.g., liraglutide, pioglitazone). Kindly write minimum 250 words abstract | The suggest changes are made |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically robust. It adheres to standard systematic review and meta-analysis protocols, including a comprehensive literature search, risk of bias assessment, and sensitivity analysis. The inclusion of diverse studies strengthens the reliability of the conclusions. However, minor revisions are recommended to enhance clarity and address potential limitations. | Ok Thanks |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references are adequate and include recent studies relevant to NAFLD management. To further strengthen the manuscript, consider including the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> "Advances in Pharmacotherapy for NAFLD: From Mechanisms to Clinical Trials," published in <i>Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology</i>, 2023. "The Role of Lifestyle Modification in NAFLD Management: A Review of Current Evidence," published in <i>Journal of Hepatology</i>, 2022. | Ok Included |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical and typographical corrections are recommended to ensure consistency and readability. | Ok |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider providing more details on subgroup analyses (e.g., gender, age) to enhance the depth of the discussion. 2. Include a discussion on the cost-effectiveness of pharmacotherapy versus lifestyle interventions, as this is a critical factor in treatment decisions. 3. Ensure that all abbreviations are defined at first use in the text | Ok reflected |

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? | <i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |