

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129999
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Bioactive Molecules for Antidiabetic Properties: A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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 provides a comprehensive review of bioactive molecules with antidiabetic properties, emphasizing their diverse mechanisms of action, sources, and therapeutic potential. As diabetes remains a significant global health challenge, the comparative analysis of phytochemicals, peptides, and synthetic compounds offers valuable insights into safer and more effective therapeutic strategies. By consolidating current knowledge, the manuscript highlights critical advancements and challenges in the field, paving the way for further research and innovation. Its findings can guide future studies and clinical applications, promoting improved diabetes management and patient outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Comparative Study of Bioactive Molecules for Antidiabetic Properties: A Review," is clear and descriptive, reflecting the manuscript's focus on the comparative analysis of bioactive molecules with antidiabetic properties.	

### Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive in summarizing the manuscript's purpose, focus, and key points. It provides an overview of the importance of diabetes management, the exploration of bioactive molecules, their mechanisms of action, and their potential applications. However, a few adjustments could improve clarity and completeness: Include a mention of specific categories of bioactive molecules (e.g., polyphenols, flavonoids, or peptides) to give readers a glimpse of the diversity discussed. Add a sentence about future perspectives to strengthen the conclusion. For example, "The study emphasizes the need for further research into synergistic effects and formulation strategies to improve their clinical use."</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, as it provides detailed information on bioactive molecules and their mechanisms of action, supported by references to credible sources. The inclusion of well-categorized tables, mechanisms, and examples for each class of bioactive compounds enhances its scientific rigor. Additionally, the focus on the comparative analysis of phytochemicals, peptides, and synthetic compounds aligns with contemporary research trends in diabetes management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observations:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scientific Validity: Mechanisms of action, such as insulin sensitization, enzyme inhibition, and antioxidant effects, are consistent with current scientific understanding.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Potential Areas for Validation: The cited references appear credible and relevant, further substantiating the claims made in the manuscript.</li> <li>- Ensure that all references are up-to-date and accurately cited. Confirm that the claims about specific compounds, such as berberine and ginsenosides, align with recent clinical findings.</li> <li>- Suggestions for Improvement: Consider including a critical discussion of any contradictory findings in the literature regarding the efficacy or safety of the bioactive molecules discussed. Address the bioavailability challenges or pharmacokinetics of the bioactive molecules in more depth to provide a balanced view.</li> </ul>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a robust list of references, many of which appear to be from reputable journals and align with the content discussed.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear explanations of concepts and detailed descriptions of mechanisms, examples, and analyses. However, a few areas could be improved to ensure better readability and alignment with academic writing standards.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p><u>Optional/General Comments:</u></p> <p>The conclusion could further emphasize emerging research trends, such as nanotechnology, personalized medicine, or combinatorial approaches, to inspire future studies. Highlighting potential translational applications, such as the integration of bioactive molecules into functional foods or therapeutic formulations, would increase the manuscript's practical impact.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Gheraissa Noura</p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p>University of El Oued, Algeria</p>