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## PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comments (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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | - The use of the leptin in must ne leptin hormone in the whole of manuscript  
- The underlying mechanism of the leptin it was clearly explained  
- RESULTS- explain the variables significant different must be explain briefly in table 1  
- Present the models in a table form  
- Why placing the reference below on the last paragraph  
- DISCUSION- please explain the first paragraph  
- Why police officers and school instructors?  
- The last paragraph is very confusion  
- CONCLUSION: One sentences for conclusion is not adequate enough, you need to add more  
- Needs to work on the grammar  
- Check your references |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | |
| **Optional/General** comments | The manuscripts need some serious work in the following areas:  
- Contents  
- Grammar  
- The quality of work needs some serious attention  
- The references are not consistence and |
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