



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57275

Title: Comparative Effectiveness of Contemporary Weight Loss Injections and Established Bariatric Procedures

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

Strength of the study

- Covers a highly relevant and current topic in obesity management
- Includes comparison of both medical and surgical treatment options
- Uses data from major clinical trials and guidelines
- Tables on page 2 and 3 clearly summarize drugs and surgical procedures
- Figures on page 4 and 5 help in understanding weight loss and durability trends
- Provides practical clinical interpretation and decision making insights
- Discussion includes safety, efficacy, and long term outcomes
- Well structured with logical flow from introduction to conclusion

Weakness of the study

- Narrative review without systematic methodology
- Comparison between drugs and surgery is indirect
- No clear inclusion and exclusion criteria for literature
- Lack of statistical synthesis or meta analysis
- Some sections are very lengthy and descriptive
- Minor language and formatting issues
- Ethical clearance statement not mentioned
- Limited critical appraisal of individual studies

Reviewers Comments

The manuscript presents a comprehensive and timely review comparing modern weight loss injections with established bariatric procedures. The topic is highly relevant, and the paper effectively summarizes key findings from major trials and guidelines. Tables on page 2 and page 3 clearly present the characteristics of injectable therapies and surgical procedures, while figures on page 4 and page 5 help in visualizing weight loss outcomes and durability patterns. The discussion on safety, cardiometabolic outcomes, and treatment selection is practical and useful for clinicians. However, the study is a narrative review and lacks a clearly defined systematic methodology for literature selection, which limits its scientific rigor. Ethical clearance is not applicable for this type of work, but a statement should be included for clarity. The writing is generally clear, though some sections are lengthy and could be made more concise. The comparison between pharmacological and surgical approaches is largely indirect and should be interpreted cautiously, as also mentioned by the authors. Overall, the manuscript is informative and clinically useful but would benefit from improved structure, clarity, and critical analysis.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT