

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56841

Title: Effectiveness of a Digital Lifestyle Medicine Program in Adults With Metabolic Syndrome: A Narrative Review

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- The study offers a comprehensive overview of digital lifestyle medicine interventions targeting metabolic syndrome, covering various modalities such as mobile applications, wearables, telehealth, and multimodal programs.
- It synthesizes recent and relevant evidence from diverse study designs including randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, and observational studies.
- The review emphasizes key clinical outcomes like waist circumference, blood pressure, lipid profiles, and MetS remission rates, providing a holistic assessment.
- The discussion incorporates current trends such as AI-driven personalization, behavioral theories, and digital equity, which are highly pertinent to advancing digital health interventions.
- The manuscript addresses a significant global health issue, given the rising prevalence of metabolic syndrome worldwide.

Weaknesses of the Study

- As a narrative review, the methodology lacks the systematic rigor and meta-analytical quantification found in systematic reviews or meta-analyses, limiting the strength of evidence conclusions.
- The review period extends to 2025, which indicates future or ongoing studies; however, the manuscript does not clarify how this inclusion timeframe was managed or justified.
- The potential for publication bias is not explicitly discussed, which could overstate the effectiveness of digital interventions.
- There is limited critique of the heterogeneity across included studies, particularly regarding intervention types, duration, and population differences.
- The paper does not specify whether ethical approval was required or obtained, which is standard in research involving human data or participant studies, although this may not be mandatory for a review.
- The presentation of references is somewhat inconsistent, with varying formats and some missing details.
- Minor grammatical and typographical issues are present, affecting clarity and professionalism.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer Comments

- **Title and Abstract:** The title clearly reflects the content of the paper. The abstract effectively summarizes the background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions but could be improved by explicitly stating the limitations and scope of the review.
- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction thoroughly contextualizes the importance of digital interventions in managing MetS and defines key terms effectively. The objectives are clear but could benefit from explicit mention of the review's scope and inclusion criteria.
- **Methodology and Analysis:** The review methodology is described but lacks detail on the search strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and quality assessment procedures. As it is a narrative review, statistical analysis is absent; inclusion of a systematic approach, even in narrative form, would enhance rigor.
- **Results and Discussion:** The results are well-organized, highlighting key findings from different intervention types and their clinical outcomes. The discussion appropriately interprets these findings within the current landscape but could better address study heterogeneity and limitations.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusion summarizes key messages but should more explicitly recommend areas for future research, especially regarding long-term effectiveness and health equity.
- **Ethical Clearance:** The manuscript, being a review, did not involve new human subjects research; thus, ethical approval is typically not required. Clarification on this point should be added.
- **Language and Presentation:** The manuscript is generally well-written but contains minor grammatical errors and inconsistent formatting. Improving clarity and polishing language would enhance readability.
- **Tables, Figures, References:** The included table summarizing key studies is informative but needs formatting improvements for clarity. References are comprehensive but should follow a consistent citation style.