

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_84845
Title of the Manuscript:	MODULATION OF OBESITY IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA USING COENZYME Q10: A REVIEW
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.journalajrimps.com/index.php/AJRIMPS/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	<p>The manuscript only deals with the issue of obesity and has not been able to make a connection between Q10 and obesity.</p> <p>Instead of describing obesity and Q10, the authors should have examined the relationship between the two.</p>	Thank you for your review and comments. In the manuscript, the section labelled "Role of CoQ <sub>10</sub> in the management of obesity" does justice to the relationship between CoQ <sub>10</sub> and obesity
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The material written about obesity should have been written in one to two pages, and the rest of the material written about the mechanism of Q10 and obesity.</p> <p>The number of articles reviewed is unknown.</p> <p>The number of articles from which the content was extracted is not known.</p> <p>The methodology is not mentioned correctly.</p> <p>The introduction does not discuss the possible mechanism of Q10</p> <p>The discussion and conclusion are not well articulated.</p>	<p>I have improved the discussion and conclusion. This is evident in the manuscript's highlighted parts (where changes were made).</p> <p>Content was extracted from 71 articles.</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)	