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General comments

For a local context, this is an important study, as there is no recent meta-analysis of obesity in older adults in Iran. Although, it has to be strengthened to be published

1. Recent reports and consensus have recommended to reject the term elderly and to prefer the terms older person or older adult, to be more respectful to the individuals that experience the ageing process. Then, it is suggested to change the term throughout the manuscript.

Methodology

1. Searching strategy is not clear. It is missing, for example, if there's was a manual search in the reference section of the papers included and if some strategy was taken if the complete text was not found through the initial search. It would be essential to know if authors were contacted for additional information if needed.

2. No definition of obesity is given. There is not clear if BMI or waist circumference or hip-waist ratio was considered. If BMI were considered, it would be necessary to mention the criteria used for the diagnosis, as many authors have established particular cutoff points for older adults.

3. Eligibility criteria are incomplete. ¿What was the targeted age? ¿healthy or with comorbidities populations were included?.

4. It is not clear what happened when a duplicate publication of another study was found or the strategy that was followed in cases of multiple publications from the same population or cohort.

5. There is no clear explanation of the analysis of the studies sample size and variance of each article. On the other hand, there is no clarity in the analysis section, what tests were used to evaluate the probability of publication bias. It is true that Egger test and Begg and Mazumdar's rank correlation test, as well as significance level, are mentioned on the results section, but is not the best place to report this critical information.
6. It is not clear if a meta-analysis to estimate pooled prevalence, usually a random-effects model, was conducted. Probably a subgroup analyses to examine the possible effects of the included studies quality or other variables could be relevant. It is not clear in the analysis section if it was done or not.

Results

7. It is essential to include a clear explanation of the population characteristics in the results section. For example, the total number of individuals or media of age need to be in this section, not in the discussions, as it is.

8. In page 6 it mentions a "checklist of data from selected articles". It seems to be part of the used methodology, not a result. Probably the name of the table needs to be changed to clarify that is an article characteristics table.

Discussion

9. No clear comparison with other studies is made. It only describes other studies, but there is no clear relation to the results of the present analysis.

10. It is important to note that, for a meta-analysis to be valid, an exhaustive search is needed. In this context, a better search and accessibility strategy needed to be done to have the complete contents of the articles. Additionally, the authors mentioned in the limitations sections that "low-quality studies" were used, but there are not clear quality criteria explained in the methodology section.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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