

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_97532
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Thyroid Stimulating Hormone and Free thyroxine among Diabetes Mellitus Patients at Shendi Locality, Sudan
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript for the subject matter is important for the scientific community but its conclusions do not contribute anything new 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive 4. Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. I consider that the handling of the data is correct, but there is no contribution of new knowledge nor does it offer use to that obtained in its study 6. The reference are sufficient and recent 7. The manuscript has a good presentation, it is understandable, the data treatment is adequate, the references are well related, but they do not mention the objective of the study and there is no new contribution. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes the language have good quality for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>While the study lives up to its title, it does not present a clear objective. and it does not mention the importance of relating these 2 situations. It would be very interesting to know how we could relate the determination of TSH in a way that supports preventive management towards diabetes</p> <p>This manuscript cannot be rated according to its overall rating proposal because it is a well-presented article that complies with its title, but it does not have a clear objective and does not contribute new knowledge.</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ricardo Leon Sanchez Consuegra
Department, University & Country	Universidad Libre, Colombia