

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_127633
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Sudden Weight Loss as an Early Indicator of Diabetes Onset in Prediabetic and Newly Diagnosed Diabetic Patients
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 is noteworthy for the scientific community as it highlights the potential role of unexplained sudden weight loss as an early diagnostic indicator of diabetes. Also, by recognizing this symptom as a potential marker, the study highlights the crucial role of early detection in facilitating timely intervention and effective management of diabetes and its associated complications. Finally, this research contributes to the greater understanding of early clinical signs of diabetes, paving the way for further studies on metabolic and diagnostic biomarkers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of this article is clear and informative.	
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 is fairly comprehensive, covering the vital parts of the study, including the background, objective, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, there are a few areas where it could be enhanced for clarity and depth: 1. Background of the study: The background could briefly mention why sudden weight loss has been understudied in relation to diabetes. This would provide a stronger rationale for the study. Author could say " Despite being a commonly observed symptom, the role of unexplained weight loss as an early diagnostic marker for diabetes remains inadequately explored. " 2. Study Population: Author is advised to include details about the sample size, demographic information, or study setting in order to add context and improve comprehensiveness. 3. Methodology: It is helpful mentioning SPSS, however, if more detail about the statistical methods or tests used is provided, it would strengthen the methodology section. For instance, author could say " Logistic regression analysis was performed to evaluate the association between sudden weight loss and diabetes diagnosis. "	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based on the detailed content provided in the manuscript, it is scientifically correct; however, incorporating findings from studies published in the last 2–3 years will help enhance its relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references from 2022 and 2023 (e.g., Galicia-Garcia et al., 2020; Haddad et al., 2023) are good to go, as they provide up-to-date insights into the current state of research. These recent publications are critical to reveal advancements in the field. However, there are a few older references (e.g., Meetoo et al., 2007 and Franz, 2007), which might benefit from updates to reflect newer findings in diabetes treatment, complications, and management strategies.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>The author did a good job by summarizing the state of knowledge in the field of diabetes research. To further strengthen the manuscript, the author should consider providing a deeper analysis of the pathophysiological mechanisms of diabetes, particularly in relation to the specific metabolic processes discussed. This would demonstrate a more comprehensive understanding and engage the reader more effectively.</p> <p>The study mentions both UCI Machine Learning Repository and data from "Sylhet Diabetes Hospital in Sylhet, Bangladesh" in the same paragraph, creating some confusion about where the data was collected. I will advise the author to maintain consistency and clarify whether the data was from the UCI repository or Sylhet Diabetes Hospital. If both are involved, explain their connection. For example: "The data were originally gathered from patients at Sylhet Diabetes Hospital in Bangladesh using self-reported questionnaires and were later made available in the UCI Machine Learning Repository."</p> <p>The methodology should be rewritten, thus: This cross-sectional study utilized secondary data from the Early Stage Diabetes Risk Prediction Dataset, available from the UCI Machine Learning Repository. The dataset, which includes information on patients from Sylhet Diabetes Hospital in Sylhet, Bangladesh, was originally collected using self-reported questionnaires. The data included variables such as age, gender, diabetes symptoms (polydipsia, polyuria, sudden weight loss), and diabetes diagnosis. Statistical analysis was conducted using Logistic regression analysis in SPSS software to assess the correlation between sudden weight loss and diabetes diagnosis. The dataset was anonymized and publicly available, with the original study adhering to ethical guidelines and obtaining informed consent from participants.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Owo, Gogo James
Department, University & Country	Charams Academy, Nigeria