

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_117498
Title of the Manuscript:	Part 1: Exploring the Metabolic Implications of Dextrin and Maltodextrin on Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Insulin Resistance: A Systematic Analysis
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.journalbji.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important because it tries to the Metabolic Implications of Dextrin and Maltodextrin on Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Insulin Resistance. Diabetes being a disease and interest in public health</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is very comprehensive</p> <p>4. If the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but they are incomplete and somewhat disordered, there is more discussion in the introduction than in the discussion itself, the recommendations are not clear or do not define anything about what was investigated, I do not know if there are figures or tables but At least a forest plot is necessary, in terms of material and methods they do not say how they chose the articles if they used a prism-type scale, etc.</p> <p>5. Not their material and method should be described better, they should give clearer conclusions and recommendations, describing what type of dextrin and maltodextrin they found in the studies or establishing if it was only stevia. They refer to animal studies but nothing is discussed about them or they are compared with those done in humans.</p> <p>6. Most of the references are recent but I think they should have looked for more references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, I think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

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