Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_111013
Title of the Manuscript:	Non Alcoholic Fatty liver disease; Disease burden, management, and future Perspectives
Type of the Article	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? ([Please wife few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the sittle of the article suitable? (If not please suigned an alternative sittle) 3. Is the abstract of the article suitable? (If not please suigned an alternative sittle) 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. Lacks recent literature survey and slarify of scientific findings as per review perspective. Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. **Lacks the content related to litestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. **Minor REVISION comments** 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Not in present form. If the author adds the possible management strategies that can help target the pathophysiology associated with disease. The content is too general to suit the title, needs to add recent scientific incline to management of disease. The content is too general to suit the title, needs to add recent scientific incline to management of disease. The content is too general to suit the title, needs to add recent scientific incline to management strategies that can help target the pathophysiology associated with disease. The content is too general to suit the title, needs to add recent scientific incline to management strategies that can help target the pathophysiology associated with disease. The content is too general to suit the title, needs to add recent scientific incline to management of disease. The content is too general to suit the title, needs to ad		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)
(Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 8 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. • Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific diagnosis. • Improper analysis of the scientific incline to management of disease. Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. • Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like eticlogy and diagnosis. • Improper analysis of the scientific incline to management of disease. Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. • Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like eticlogy and diagnosis. • Improper analysis of the scientific incline to management of disease. Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good	<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
(If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. • Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like etiology and diagnosis. • Improper analysis of the scientific findings as per review perspective. • Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. • Lacks the content related to lifestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good			
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. • Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like etiology and diagnosis. • Improper analysis of the scientific findings as per review perspective. • Possible targets for the rapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. • Lacks the content related to lifestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Mimor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good			
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) NO Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. • Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like etiology and diagnosis. • Improper analysis of the scientific findings as per review perspective. • Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. • Lacks the content related to lifestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good	3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?		
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 5 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. • Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like etiology and diagnosis. • Improper analysis of the scientific findings as per review perspective. • Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. • Lacks the content related to litestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good Good	4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. • Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like etiology and diagnosis. • Improper analysis of the scientific findings as per review perspective. • Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. • Lacks the content related to lifestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good	5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?		
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) Please find the comments for the manuscript received for review. Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like etiology and diagnosis. Improper analysis of the scientific findings as per review perspective. Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. Lacks the content related to lifestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good			
Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted for clinical approach associated with disease like etiology and diagnosis. Improper analysis of the scientific findings as per review perspective. Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. Lacks the content related to lifestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good		NO	
Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation. Lacks the content related to lifestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good		Lacks recent literature survey and clarity of scientific analysis of various methods adopted	
Lacks the content related to lifestyle changes and use of traditional medicines and plant derivatives for therapeutic intervention. Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good		Improper analysis of the scientific findings as per review perspective.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good		Possible targets for therapeutic intervention with mechanistic explanation.	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Good			
communications? Good	Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Good	
	Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		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)	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anamika
Department, University & Country	Ramjas College, University of Delhi, India

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)