

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_113915
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative effects of fermented and unfermented Parkia biglobosa bean seeds in diabetic induced experimental rats.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Importance to the Scientific Community: The manuscript addresses a relevant and vital issue in the field, making a noteworthy contribution to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Suitability of the Title: The title accurately reflects the manuscript's content and effectively communicates the focus of the study.</p> <p>3. Comprehensiveness of the Abstract: The abstract provides a comprehensive study overview, summarizing the key objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. It effectively communicates the significance of the research.</p> <p>4. Appropriateness of Subsections and Structure: The manuscript is well-organized, and the subsections appropriately divide the content. The structure follows a logical flow, enhancing the readability of the document.</p> <p>5. Scientific Accuracy: The manuscript's scientific content is accurate, and the methods and results are well-supported.</p> <p>6. References: While the references provided are sufficient, I recommend updating them to include more recent publications to enhance the relevance of the literature review. Additionally, there is a need for consistency in the formatting of references. Ensure that all references follow the same format, and please italicize plant scientific names for uniformity.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Language/English Quality: The language and overall quality of English are suitable for scholarly communication. However, the manuscript requires significant proofreading to address grammatical errors, improve sentence structure, and enhance overall clarity. We have made some corrections to improve comprehensibility, but additional proofreading is essential for a polished final version.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I believe that with the necessary revisions, the manuscript has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the scientific literature.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Naima Fatehi
Department, University & Country	Algeria