

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_130763
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Potential Underreporting of Overweight and Obesity in Children Aged 6–11 Years in a Primary Care Unit: A Cross-Sectional Study
Type of the Article	Original Research

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>

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 highlights the critical issue of underreporting overweight and obesity in children within primary care settings, emphasizing gaps in diagnosis and referral. Given the rising prevalence of paediatric obesity and its long-term health consequences, the study provides valuable insights into missed opportunities for early intervention. By identifying disparities in referral patterns based on sex, it underscores the need for standardized screening and improved clinical practices. The findings contribute to public health strategies aimed at enhancing nutritional assessment and management in paediatric primary care.	We appreciate your insightful suggestions, which have helped us refine and strengthen the manuscript.  Title Revision: We have revised the title to make it more concise, following your suggestion: "Underreporting of Overweight and Obesity in Primary Care: A Cross-Sectional Study of Children Aged 6–11 Years."
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and informative, but it could be more concise. Consider: "Underreporting of Overweight and Obesity in Primary Care: A Cross-Sectional Study of Children Aged 6–11 Years." This version maintains clarity while improving readability.	Abstract and Keywords: We have updated the keywords to better reflect the study's focus, including terms such as "child obesity"; "childhood overweight"; "malnutrition"; "nutritional status"; and "referral". Additionally, we have specified the criteria used for classifying nutritional status, incorporating references to the WHO growth charts for clarity.
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 comprehensive, but the keywords should better reflect the study focus (e.g., "malnutrition," "nutritional status," "paediatric obesity"). Additionally, specifying the criteria for classifying nutritional status (e.g., WHO or CDC growth charts) would enhance clarity. Minor grammatical refinements, such as "The data collection was conducted from January 2022 to December 2022," would improve readability.	Grammatical and Linguistic Refinements: We have reviewed and refined the manuscript to improve clarity, consistency, and readability.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound. It accurately identifies key gaps in the diagnosis, referral, and management of paediatric nutritional disorders, supported by relevant studies and literature. The discussion appropriately ties the findings to existing research and provides actionable recommendations for improving care in primary care settings.	Regional Context and References: We have incorporated additional region-specific studies on paediatric obesity in Mexico and primary care screening practices to enhance contextual relevance. Additionally, we have ensured that key guidelines from the WHO on childhood obesity classification are appropriately cited to strengthen the study's foundation.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are extensive, relevant, and include recent sources up to 2024. However, adding more region-specific studies on paediatric obesity in Mexico and primary care screening practices could enhance the manuscript's contextual relevance. Additionally, ensuring key guidelines from WHO or CDC on childhood obesity classification are cited would strengthen the study's foundation.	We believe these revisions have significantly improved the manuscript's clarity, scientific rigour, and contextual relevance. Please

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, formal, and appropriately structured for an academic audience. However, minor revisions for clarity and consistency in phrasing could further enhance readability and flow.	
Optional/General comments	<p>To enhance the manuscript, I suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Clarify Limitations:</b> Provide more explicit details on the limitations of the study, particularly regarding potential biases and the generalizability of the results.</li><li>• <b>Strengthen Conclusion:</b> The conclusion could more directly link the findings to specific, actionable recommendations for clinical practice and policy change.</li><li>• <b>Expand on Future Research:</b> Consider briefly discussing potential directions for future research, such as exploring the reasons behind underreporting or evaluating the effectiveness of proposed interventions.</li><li>• <b>References Update:</b> Ensure that the references are up-to-date, especially regarding recent studies on paediatric obesity and undernutrition.</li></ul> <p>These adjustments could improve the clarity and impact of the study, reinforcing its relevance and potential for influencing practice and policy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your thoughtful and constructive feedback. We appreciate your suggestions for improving the manuscript's clarity and impact.</p> <p>In response to your recommendations, we have:</p> <p>Clarified the study's limitations by providing more explicit details on potential biases and the generalisability of the findings. Strengthened the conclusion by directly linking the results to actionable recommendations for clinical practice and policy change. Expanded on future research directions by discussing the need to investigate the reasons behind underreporting and assess the effectiveness of proposed interventions. Updated the references to include recent studies on paediatric obesity and undernutrition, ensuring the study is well-supported by current evidence.</p> <p>We believe these revisions have enhanced the manuscript's clarity, relevance, and potential impact on clinical practice and policy. Please let us know if any further refinements are needed.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	