

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_130661
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF VARIOUS FORMULATIONS OF COCOYAM-BAMBARA GROUNDNUT-SOYA BEAN FLOUR BLENDS ON THE SERUM LIPIDS & INFLAMMATORY BIOMARKERS OF STREPTOZOTOCIN-INDUCED 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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it explores an affordable and natural dietary approach to managing diabetes mellitus, a major global health challenge. By evaluating the effects of a cocoyam, Bambara groundnut, and soya bean flour blend on serum lipid profiles, bilirubin, and inflammatory biomarkers in diabetic rats, the study provides compelling evidence for its potential therapeutic benefits. The findings highlight the nutritional value and efficacy of this formulation, particularly its hypocholesterolemic and anti-inflammatory properties, which surpassed those of a standard antidiabetic drug in certain parameters. This research offers a promising avenue for developing cost-effective and sustainable dietary strategies for diabetes management, with significant implications for public health.	Thanks for the comments. ok
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is descriptive and provides a clear idea of the study's focus. However, it is somewhat lengthy and could be simplified for better readability while maintaining clarity. Here's a suggestion for a revised title: "Effects of Cocoyam-Bambara Groundnut-Soya Bean Flour Blends on Serum Lipids and Inflammatory Biomarkers in Diabetic Rats"	Thanks for the comments. Noted .

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The abstract is slightly long and contains some redundant or overly detailed points. For example, the description of flour preparation could be condensed.</li><li>• Add Context to Results: While formulation 1 is highlighted, the results for other formulations are not discussed. A brief mention of whether other formulations showed significant effects could improve the balance.</li><li>• Clarify Objectives and Implications: The aim of the study is stated, but its broader implications for the scientific community or public health could be emphasized.</li><li>• Delete Technical Details in Methodology: Specific percentages (16.6% CY, etc.) may not be necessary in the abstract but can remain in the main text.</li></ul>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p><b>Introduction Section:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• "due to the prevalence, disability and mortality" → "due to its prevalence, associated disability, and mortality."</li><li>• "As a pancreatic organ disorder" → "As a disorder affecting the pancreas."</li><li>• "The presence of bioactive compounds in these functional foods and their biochemical effects invivo" → "The presence of bioactive compounds in these functional foods and their biochemical effects in vivo."</li><li>• "have been identified in these plant foods, including the isoflavones, stilbene, and flavonoids" → "have been identified in these plant foods, including isoflavones, stilbenes, and flavonoids."</li><li>• "In finding solutions to these menace" → "In finding solutions to this menace."</li><li>• "diabetic diets used in the Western Nations proving effective" → "diabetic diets used in Western nations proving effective."</li></ul> <p><b>Materials and Methods Section:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• "The Bambara groundnut, soya bean and cocoyam were purchased" → "The Bambara groundnut, soybean, and cocoyam were purchased."</li><li>• "oven-dried at a temperature of 600C" → "oven-dried at a temperature of 60°C."</li><li>• "and stored for future use" → "and stored for later use."</li><li>• "The body weights of the rats were recorded and the protocols for handling experimental animals followed" → "The body weights of the rats were recorded, and protocols for handling experimental animals were followed."</li><li>□ <b>Induction of Insulin Resistance Using Low Fructose Diet:</b></li><li>• "low dose fructose diet for six days" → "low-dose fructose diet for six days."</li><li>□ <b>Induction of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus using STZ:</b></li><li>• "with streptozotocin (STZ) prepared as 1 g in 50 mL of freshly prepared sodium citrate buffer" → "with streptozotocin (STZ) prepared as 1 g in 50 mL of freshly prepared sodium citrate buffer."</li><li>• "Post STZ treatment, blood samples were collected from the rats and estimated for blood glucose levels at days 6 and 12" → "Post-STZ treatment, blood samples were collected from the rats, and blood glucose levels were estimated on days 6 and 12."</li><li>□ <b>Table 1:</b></li><li>• The abbreviations for the formulations and compositions should be clear and consistent throughout the manuscript. Ensure that terms like "CY," "SB," and "BGN" are clearly defined earlier in the text.</li></ul> <p><b>Results Section:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• "Figure 1 showed that Group A were least while Group B and D were the highest for both markers" → "Figure 1 shows that Group A had the lowest values, while Groups B and D had the highest values for both markers."</li><li>• "T-BILL and D-BILL has no significant (p&gt;0.05) mean difference among the groups" → "T-BILL and D-BILL had no significant (p&gt;0.05) mean difference among the groups."</li><li>• "However mean values for TP, ALB and GLB were significantly (p&lt;0.05) different" → "However, mean values for TP, ALB, and GLB were significantly (p&lt;0.05) different."</li><li>• "Significant (p&lt;0.05) difference among the groups were observed" → "A significant (p&lt;0.05) difference among the groups was observed."</li></ul> <p><b>Discussion Section:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• "Cytokines which are soluble factors are engaged in recruiting leucocytes" → "Cytokines, which are soluble factors, are involved in recruiting leukocytes."</li><li>• "Circulating cytokines can provide the general state of inflammation in the individual" →</li></ul>	<p>Thanks for the comments. Noted and revised as per the suggestions</p>

Review Form 3

	<p>"Circulating cytokines can indicate the general state of inflammation in an individual."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>"and TNF-α are raised in patients with metabolic syndrome and sub-clinically overt T2DM" → "and TNF-α are elevated in patients with metabolic syndrome and sub-clinically overt T2DM."</li><li>"other intervention formulations used in groups E, G, H, I and J were not as protective as those used in Groups A and F as they had higher CRP values" → "Other intervention formulations used in Groups E, G, H, I, and J were not as protective as those used in Groups A and F, as they exhibited higher CRP values."</li></ul>	
<b>Noted and Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references need to be formatted consistently (author names, year of publication, title, etc.) and checked for accuracy.	Thanks for the comments
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though it would benefit from improved clarity, grammatical accuracy, and consistency in terminology to enhance readability and precision.	Ok
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Based on the content provided, there are no obvious ethical issues in the manuscript. <b>Based on the content provided, there are no explicit indications of competing interests in the manuscript.</b></p> <p>The manuscript presents interesting content, but the language quality needs improvement to meet the scholarly communication standards, particularly in terms of clarity and precision. There are also some mistakes that need to be addressed, including proper acknowledgment of sources and potential conflicts of interest. A minor revision is required to refine the writing, ensure proper citations, and resolve any ethical or competing interest issues before considering it for publication.</p>	Thanks for the comments

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	