

	<b>Editor's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Marginally. While MAT for OUD in residential settings is a relevant topic, the review mainly reiterates known findings. It fails to move the conversation forward or present a clear conceptual framework. Much of the evidence is descriptive rather than evaluative. The value to the scientific community would increase with clearer theoretical grounding or meta-analytic synthesis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes, the title is appropriate. It's specific and informative. An alternative could be:  "Comparing Buprenorphine, Methadone, and XR-Naltrexone for OUD Recovery: A Review of Evidence from Residential Settings"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract covers scope, methodology, findings, and implications. However, it omits methodological rigor (e.g., inclusion criteria, study types) and should clarify the comparative outcomes rather than summarizing all MATs equally.  <b>Suggestions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Report the number of studies included.</li> <li>● Clarify that results are based on secondary literature, not new data.</li> <li>● Temper claims about long-term outcomes given the methodological heterogeneity in the reviewed studies.</li> </ul>	

<p>Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions</p>	<p>Generally, yes, but too much redundancy and repetition. Several sections, especially “Results” and “Discussion,” restate the same findings with slight rewording. The manuscript would benefit from a tighter edit. Tone is overly promotional at times and needs to adopt a more neutral academic voice.</p>	
<p>Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.</p>	<p><b>Introduction:</b> The first two pages repeat the same background points without adding depth. Introduce the research gap sooner.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b> Describes a systematic search but lacks a PRISMA diagram or details about the quality assessment of included studies beyond a vague mention. No table of included studies.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> Descriptive summaries dominate. Comparative insights are surface-level. There’s no assessment of effect sizes, population differences, or limitations of individual studies.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Largely reiterates Results. Needs to highlight contradictions in the literature and address heterogeneity in outcomes more directly.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Clear but overstated. The evidence base doesn’t fully support the strength of recommendations made here.</p>	
<p>Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.</p>	<p>Yes. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some key studies on MAT disparities (e.g., racial/ethnic or rural access gaps) are missing.</li> <li>• The review relies heavily on a small number of primary studies (e.g., Lee et al. is cited excessively).</li> <li>• No recent federal or policy guidelines are referenced, which</li> </ul>	

	could enhance the policy relevance of the findings.	
--	---	--

**PART 1: Article Title:** The manuscript addresses an important public health issue, but it falls short in novelty and analytic depth. The work summarizes existing research but lacks critical synthesis and does not present new insights into clinical or policy implications beyond what is already known in the field.

**PART 2:**

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i>  No	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	None declared.	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No evidence of plagiarism.	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	No	

**PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:**

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

**I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.**

**PART 4: Objective Evaluation:**

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
-----------	--------------------------

<p>Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript ( Highest: 10 Lowest: 0 )</p> <p><b><u>Guideline:</u></b> Accept As It Is: (&gt;9-10) Minor Revision: (&gt;8-9) Major Revision: (&gt;7-8) Serious Major revision: (&gt;5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (&gt;3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (&gt;0-3)</p>	<p><b>Major revision: 7/10</b></p>
--	------------------------------------