

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_129663
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Potential And The Effect of Ethanol And Aqueous Extracts of Plukenetia Conophora Leaf On The Body Weight and Blood Glucose Concentrations Of Diabetic Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	<p>The language quality in the manuscript is subpar, with issues in clarity, coherence, and overall readability. The writing lacks precision and proper structure, making it difficult to follow the author's arguments and ideas. Additionally, there are frequent grammatical errors. which hinder the flow of the content and detract from the professionalism of the manuscript.</p> <p>I find the article underwhelming because the research or findings (Proximate composition) presented by the author have already been published elsewhere. This repetition of previously established work diminishes the originality and impact of the article, making it seem less innovative and more like a reworking of existing knowledge.</p>	<p>The authors have improved on the language of the manuscript and grammatical errors corrected as requested by reviewer.</p>
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title does not meet the standard expected for a scholarly manuscript. It is either too vague, overly simplistic, or lacks specificity, making it unclear or uninformative about the content of the paper.</p>	<p>The opinion of the reviewer is acknowledged but the authors felt that nutrients could have positive effect on bio indicators of diabetes. The location, methodology, parts of plant etc could affect results.</p>

Review Form 3

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 is poorly organized and lacks clarity, making it difficult to follow the main points and purpose of the study. The information is presented in a disjointed manner, with key elements such as the research objectives, methods, results, and conclusions not clearly distinguished or logically structured. This hampers the reader's ability to quickly grasp the significance of the research. Additionally, the writing is overly complex or vague, contributing to the overall confusion and making it less effective in summarizing the core findings of the study.	Abstract have been revised by authors.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The article appears to be preliminary work, presenting only a limited number of analyses that are insufficient to be considered significant in the context of advancements in diabetes care. The findings are not robust enough to contribute meaningfully to the ongoing progress in the field, and the research lacks the depth and comprehensive analysis needed to support further developments in diabetes treatment and management.</p> <p>Moreover, several advancements involving the use of Plukenetia conophora have already been reported, making the current study's contributions appear less novel. Many studies have explored its potential benefits, which diminishes the impact of the present research and raises questions about its originality in the context of existing knowledge.</p> <p>Cross references</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Proximate composition, phytochemical screening and mineral content of Plukenetia conophora leaves. DOI url: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.23.2.2363Ajayi, A. M., Badaki, V., Adebayo, O. G., & Ben-Azu, B. (2022). Plukenetia conophora seed oil ameliorates streptozotocin-induced hyperglycaemia and oxidative stress in rats. Biomarkers, 27(3), 240–246. https://doi.org/10.1080/1354750X.2021.2024601	The authors acknowledge comments from the reviewer but the authors considered location, methodology, types of solvent extraction, parts of plant used etc as factors that could affect experimental results.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references quoted are a decade back, which has to be updated.	Acknowled and improved on.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality in the manuscript is below standard, with issues in grammar, sentence structure, and overall clarity. These language-related shortcomings make the content harder to understand and diminish the overall professionalism of the paper. The manuscript would benefit from thorough proofreading and revision to improve its readability and ensure that the ideas are communicated clearly and effectively.	The comments of the reviewer has enabled the authors to generally improve on language quality of the paper via review.
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	