

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3174
Title of the Manuscript:	OBESITY SUBTYPES AND SHORT TERM WEIGHT LOSS AFTER VERTICAL SLEEVE GASTRECTOMY
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the complex issue of obesity subtypes and their impact on short-term weight loss following vertical sleeve gastrectomy (VSG). By identifying distinct subtypes psychosocial, genetic, and obesogen exposure. It provides insights into which patients may benefit most from this bariatric procedure. The study's findings highlight the importance of personalized medicine in managing obesity, particularly by showing that patients with psychosocial factors exhibit better weight loss outcomes. I appreciate this manuscript for its attempt to bridge the gap in understanding individualized obesity treatment approaches, which could lead to improved surgical outcomes	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear but could be more specific in conveying the main findings. Like: Impact of Obesity Subtypes on Short-Term Weight Loss Outcomes Following Vertical Sleeve Gastrectomy	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's aims, design, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, it could be made more comprehensive by including a few additional elements and clarifying certain points such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briefly state why it is important to consider clinical subtypes in predicting post-surgical weight loss (e.g., differences in genetic predisposition, behavioral factors, etc.). Expand the results to provide more context regarding the statistically significant weight loss differences between subtypes and their potential implications for clinical practice. Include a note on how many subjects were excluded and why (due to incomplete information, etc.) in methodology. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript appears to have a generally appropriate structure.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to several key factors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First, it is based on a clear and well-defined hypothesis that clinical subtypes of obesity (psychosocial, genetic, and obesogen exposure) affect weight loss outcomes after VSG. The study design, a retrospective cohort study, is appropriate for examining these relationships in a clinical setting, and the statistical analyses used (e.g., ANOVA, Tukey Kramer test) are standard and appropriate for the data type. The findings are clearly presented, and the results are statistically significant, which adds to the scientific rigor. Additionally, the study's discussion and conclusion align with the results, reinforcing the internal consistency and technical soundness of the work. 	

Review Form2

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Author can including updated references would bring the literature review in line with recent advancements and further support the scientific claims made in the manuscript.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Janesick AS, Blumberg B (2022). "Obesogens and Metabolic Disruptions: Current Research and Future Directions." Endocrinology, 163(1): e1479–e1487. • Grun F, Blumberg B (2021). "New Insights into Obesogens and Their Role in the Obesity Epidemic." Nature Reviews Endocrinology, 17(6): 352–365. • Yengo L et al. (2021). "New Genetic Insights into Obesity: Meta-analysis and Genome-Wide Association Studies." Nature Genetics, 53(8): 1205–1212. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are minor grammatical errors and instances of missing punctuation. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing commas between clauses or in lists, such as "psychosocial factors genetic risk or early life endocrine disruptors" should be written as "psychosocial factors, genetic risk, or early life endocrine disruptors." • The manuscript uses appropriate technical terms, but some phrases could be more precise for scholarly communication. For instance, instead of "weight loss may be limited by an individual's genetic risk," it could say "weight loss outcomes may be moderated by an individual's genetic predisposition." • Ensure consistency in terminology (e.g., consistently using either "psychosocial factors" or "behavioral factors") to avoid confusion. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Manuscript is scientifically sound, but with minor revisions and updates, it could be made more robust and clearer for scholarly communication.</p> <p>The manuscript presents a well-executed study on the impact of obesity subtypes on short-term weight loss after vertical sleeve gastrectomy. The topic is highly relevant to the field of bariatric surgery and offers insights into personalized treatment approaches based on psychosocial, genetic, and environmental factors.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Susmit Kosta</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Sri Aurobindo Medical College and PG Institute, Sri Aurobindo University, India</p>