

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_116586
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of DNA Methylation in offsprings of Type 2 Diabetics
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript addresses an important topic in the field of diabetes research, specifically focusing on the impact of DNA methylation on the offspring of Type 2 diabetics. Understanding the epigenetic factors involved in the development of diabetes is crucial for both preventive and therapeutic strategies.</p> <p>The title reflects the content of the article but could be more specific to indicate the focus on offspring of Type 2 diabetics. A suggested alternative title might be: "Study of DNA Methylation in Offspring of Individuals with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus."</p> <p>The abstract provides a good overview of the study, including the introduction, methods, results, and conclusions. However, the language can be made more concise, and the key findings can be highlighted more clearly.</p> <p>The manuscript is generally well-structured with clear subsections for introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. However, the transitions between some sections can be improved for better readability.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, but there are some areas where additional details could be beneficial. For instance, a more thorough explanation of the statistical analyses used and their significance would add clarity.</p> <p>The references are generally adequate, but some are dated. It would be helpful to include more recent studies to provide a contemporary context for the research. This might include recent work on epigenetics and DNA methylation in the context of diabetes.</p> <p>Additional suggestions/comments:</p> <p>Consider providing more information on the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study participants. This will help to understand the scope of the study and its applicability to the broader population.</p> <p>The statistical significance should be clearly stated with exact p-values rather than ranges (e.g., "p<0.001" instead of "significantly different").</p> <p>Some sections could be streamlined to avoid redundancy. For example, the results section should focus on the key findings without excessive detail on methodology, which can be moved to the methods section.</p> <p>The discussion could be more focused on how the findings of this study fit within the broader context of diabetes research and the potential implications for future studies or clinical practice.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Overall, the language is suitable, but there are some grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could be improved. Consider a thorough proofreading or consultation with a professional editor to ensure clarity and accuracy.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The study has a promising approach to exploring the relationship between DNA methylation and diabetes. The results suggest potential avenues for further research and highlight the importance of lifestyle factors in epigenetic changes. However, to strengthen the manuscript, a more detailed discussion of the implications of these findings and a clearer explanation of the statistical analysis used would be beneficial.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatima Khurshid
Department, University & Country	Forman Christian College University, Pakistan