

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_126981
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-Diabetic Potential of Anacardium Occidentale Leaf Extract in Alloxan-Induced Diabetic Albino Rats
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript contains several significant limitations that need to be addressed before submission. It requires a thorough revision to strengthen its scientific rigor. As it stands, the findings and interpretations are not well-supported by strong evidence, making the work vulnerable to scrutiny. The authors should focus on refining the methodology, providing clearer data interpretation, and ensuring a more robust presentation of key points to avoid potential challenges after publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but with major revision needed	
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 lacks clarity and is overly lengthy. It should be shortened to focus on the key findings and eliminate redundant statements. Additionally, the methodology section is not well-articulated; it should provide a clearer summary of the experimental procedures. The use of GC-MS analysis should be explicitly mentioned to highlight its role in the study. Streamline the text to avoid repetition and enhance readability, ensuring all essential points are covered concisely.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Few subsections were ok.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific accuracy of the manuscript requires closer attention. Several subsections need to be revisited and corrected to enhance clarity and precision. Addressing these issues will significantly improve the scientific rigor and overall quality of the work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References were old, need to be adjusted.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript should be reviewed for language clarity using tools like Grammarly, especially after implementing the suggested corrections. This will help ensure the writing is clear, professional, and free from grammatical errors.	
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Njoku George Chigozie
Department, University & Country	University of Nebraska Medical Center, Nigeria