**Reviewer Guidelines**

Dear Reviewer,

Greetings for the day! Thank you very much for your valuable interest in reviewing the manuscript. Very simple peer-review form has been provided to make it easy for reviewers and editors to assess the quality of the manuscript precisely.

*Gists of the Reviewer guidelines are provided for your easy convenience:*

1. You are requested to read the manuscript thoroughly before you fill the form.
2. To fill the boxes, please right click and select Add text.
3. Then you may fill the review form with your comments with respect to the 6 mentioned facets of the manuscript.
4. Separate column is provided for the comments to authors where you might describe your comments.
5. In case of any concerns that are confidential only to the Editors, you might fill them in the separate section provided namely comments to the editor only. The information provided under this section will not be revealed to the authors.
6. Reviewers are requested to submit their valuable comments within the deadline. In case of any timeline extensions, they might contact Editorial Office.

**Reviewer Form**

**Article Title** **“Obesity: A Brief Approach to this New Pandemia”.**

**Assigned date: August 8th 2014 Due Date: August 12th 2014**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Hypothesis**   Rate the theoretical soundness of the manuscript | 1. **Originality**   Does the manuscript contain new innovations or insight or any Plagiarized content? | 1. **Methodology**   How would you rate the article’s methodological rigidity in presenting its experiential research? |
| 1. **Writing**   Rate both the English & Scientific Writing of the manuscript | 1. **Relevance**   How do you rate article’s relevance to journal scope & scientific community? | 1. **References Cited**   Does the References Cited serve the purpose or any other related redundancy? |

Rate Accordingly: 1 – Poor; 2 – Fair; 3 – Average; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent
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**Assessment of the Manuscript**

[ ] Accept as is

[ ] Accept with minor changes as suggested in this form without further review

[ x ] Return to author for changes and subsequently resubmit for further review

[ ] Decline

Comments to Author

The authors have written a narrative review of the causes and health-related consequences of obesity. The authors mention that potential implications of this review could be related to increase awareness around obesity and possibly develop a public health approach for the prevention of weight gain. In general the paper is well written and the authors should be applauded for attempting to summarize the large amount of literature available on obesity and health.

A weakness of the paper is the choice not to perform some type of systematic search of the literature, as well as a general brief analysis of each study without discussing or providing a critical appraisal of the many relevant details pertaining to most of the studies included. Indeed this approach leaves out many relevant studies and results in an unintentionally biased approach to the literature.

I would recommend the utilization of a more systematic approach (including using a search flowchart and quality assessment of the study included in the review). This of course would require that the authors narrow down their search and define a working hypothesis underlying their review but would give strengthen the impact of their work. For instance, could they focus on specific biological mechanisms instead of reviewing all kind of health-related issues associated with obesity. Also the conclusions could be improved in terms of expressing more clearly what the implications of their work are as well as relevant findings of their work.

Hypothesis: very vague, poor rationale of their work or how they approached the literature search. No critical appraisal of the literature.

Methodology: the authors do not report how they searched the literature

Writing: manuscript should be proofread

References: the authors should provide more references (most statements do not have references!).

Title: reformulate title, it doesn’t highlight the content of this review.

Comments to Editor only : manuscript should be proofread, punctuation and grammar should be checked. 1 sentence is in Spanish (page 5). Content is not easily understandable in the current format.