

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 holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in understanding the diabetic mellitus. By presenting novel insights and/or innovative methodologies, it provides a deeper comprehension of case study of diabetic mellitus using MLPNN. The findings have the potential to influence future research directions and practical applications in medical field. Furthermore, the work establishes a solid foundation for interdisciplinary collaboration, fostering advancements that benefit both academia and medical field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is clearly reflect the content and purpose of the manuscript.	Noted
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.	Yes, the abstract is largely comprehensive as it effectively covers the key components of a research article, It highlights the critical nature of Diabetes Mellitus (DM) and the need for early detection. The abstract is detailed and informative, making it comprehensive for a technical audience. A few minor refinements could make it more concise and emphasize the study's novelty and broader implications.	NOTED
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, It is scientifically correct related to diabetes millitus detection.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, It is sufficient and authors referred recent papers also.	Thank you and noted
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are minor punctuation issues and occasional redundancy, such as extra spaces or unneeded commas. Some areas may feel a little informal or overly detailed for a scholarly article	NOTED AND REVISED
Optional/General comments	With some minor revisions for clarity, consistency, and conciseness, the article would be well-suited for scholarly communication. The research and results are clear and significant, but tightening up the language would make it more professional and engaging for a wider academic audience. It can be considered for publication.	

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>	