

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_117512
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of the Biochemical changes in Streptozotocin (STZ)-induced diabetic rats fed differently on Cocoyam, Soya bean & Bambara groundnut flour.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  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.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	  1. The paper functions as a starting point for the explanation of research findings. It gives scientists the knowledge they need to create new theories, and it serves as the basis for new scientific advancements and discoveries.  2. You may rewrite the title as follows: " Comparative Analysis of the Biochemical changes in Streptozotocin (STZ)-induced diabetic rats fed differently on Cocoyam, Soya bean & Bambara groundnut flour "  3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.  4. The structure of the manuscript appropriate. But, as the discussion is separated, the results title should be only "results" not results and discussion.  5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.  6. References sufficient. But not recent, you may have to replace 6 ref. (10%) at least from the last 3 years (2021-2024).	Noted
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is good in general. The manuscript needs minor editing. Eg., In abstract: forty not fourty. The essence, The aim. Etc. Introduction: "adolescent nutrition, all of which", adolescent nutrition. All of which. " these plants foods" these plant foods ... Etc.	Noted
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Figures are confusing. I have reviewed the figures included in your manuscript and would like to suggest a few enhancements to ensure clarity and focus for the readers: Kindly adjust the focus on the columns within the figures to enhance their prominence and readability. Modification of column labels: Consider removing the numerical values from the column labels. You may use symbols such as stars (*) to denote specific categories or significance levels. Instead, highlight main findings In the results section, please clearly mention the main findings of the study. This will help readers quickly grasp the significant outcomes of your research. Your attention to these details will greatly improve the manuscript's presentation and the audience's comprehension of your work.	Noted

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	