

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_129780
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Artificial Neural Networks for Detecting Diabetes Mellitus Using Demographic, Clinical, Lifestyle, and Dietary Risk Factors: A Case Study from Kaura Namoda, Nigeria
Type of the 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>

Review Form 3

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 significant contributions to the scientific community in multiple ways: 1. This paper demonstrates the effectiveness of ANN in detecting diabetes using real world patient data. 2. It is used to improve diabetes prediction accuracy, so it enhances early detection and prevention. 3. This study's findings can guide medical experts in identifying high risk individuals earlier and more accurately.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is highly descriptive and suitable for the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive and effective. The abstract could be more concise by reducing redundancy in performance metrics for training, validation and test samples.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically correct with a proper method, clear results and logical conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It will improve the quality of the paper if the author incorporates additional references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of language is standard for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	<div>1. The data sample size is comparatively small. Machine Learning models trained on small dataset results overfitting. It will be better if author collects data from multiple hospitals and regions to capture diverse populations and environments.</div> <div>2. Perform cross validation to evaluate the model's performance more reliably.</div> <div>3. The related work section is currently absent in this paper. Some of the literature reviews are included in the introduction part. It should be presented as a separate section.</div> <div>4. There is a repetition of the word 'feed' in the 21st row of page 3.</div> <div>This paper fits the category of Medical Informatics. It applies ANN for diabetes risk prediction and management</div>	

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>	