

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_85284
Title of the Manuscript:	Loneliness, Lifestyles, and Lockdowns: Effects on Health
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The manuscript deals with a pretty timely topic, but the approach described in the manuscript is flawed.</li><li>2. The introduction was too focused on loneliness which does not explain the need for the study. Include more literature review on the lifestyle and Covid-19 and the relationship with loneliness in the introduction.</li><li>3. The author can include the information on how the review process took place, and it can be added<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-What are the algorithms/Methodology used for selecting review articles?</li><li>-Which year of publications has been chosen in which research articles have been chosen?</li></ul></li><li>4. The discussion part well focused on various terms such as smoking, obesity, alcohol intake, physical activity, and diet-related to health but not adequately justified in the relationship between loneliness, lifestyle and Covid-19.</li><li>5. There is a greater chance this review article would provide inaccurate findings and lead to inappropriate judgments if causal attribution is not done systematically.</li></ol>	<b>Answer:</b> Reviewer's comments appreciated and additional data incorporated as suggested. Since this is a narrative review and no new data was generated, the manuscript has avoided a more vigorous systemic analysis. The data is however accurate, and hence the extensive bibliography.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This review article is well attempted and nicely written.	

### 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)	