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|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript offers a thorough overview of inflammatory markers in polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS), particularly highlighting the role of IL-6 through a meta-analysis. With the increasing prevalence of PCOS and its connections to metabolic and cardiovascular issues, this research is both timely and significant. By gathering evidence from studies conducted between 2014 and 2024, the manuscript brings the field up to date, surpassing older reviews and adhering to PRISMA guidelines. The findings enhance our understanding of how inflammation plays a role in PCOS, which could help shape future diagnostic and treatment approaches. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is clear, descriptive, and reflects the dual scope of the paper (systematic review + meta-analysis). |  |
| 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 does a great job of summarizing everything, including the reasoning behind the study, the methods used, the results obtained, and the final conclusions drawn. Strength, It clearly outlines the databases that were searched, the time frame for inclusion, the tools used for quality assessment, and the statistical results. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | The manuscript follows PRISMA guidelines and uses appropriate tools (NOS, Cochrane RoB, ROBINS-1).Statistical methods (random-effects model, heterogeneity assessment, funnel plot, trim-and-fill, sensitivity analysis) are robust and appropriate.The interpretation of findings is consistent with the data presented.Minor issue: Given heterogeneity (I² = 69.1%), a stronger discussion on subgroup analyses (e.g., obese vs. lean PCOS) could strengthen validity. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The references are extensive, recent, and cover studies up to 2024, ensuring timeliness. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is generally clear, scholarly, and suitable for publication.Some sections are lengthy with repeated comparisons across markers; these could be condensed to improve readability.Occasional grammar refinements would improve flow (e.g., avoid redundancy such as “IL-6 levels were elevated in PCOS patients compared to controls” repeated in multiple places). |  |
| Optional/General comments | Strong and scientifically sound manuscript.Improvements recommended in abstract conciseness, title clarity, and a more nuanced discussion of heterogeneity and clinical implications. |  |
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