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/

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	Following limitations are observed I the paper, Data Representativeness, Sample Size, Data Imbalance, Variable Scope, Overfitting, Model Complexity, Data Quality, Temporal Limitation, Causal Inference, External Validation	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Yes**	
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.	**No**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Okay	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Average	
Optional/General comments	1. Single hospital data may limit generalizability. 2. The dataset of 400 patients may be too small for robust machine learning analysis. 3. Possible imbalance between DM and non-DM cases could bias results. 4. Key factors like genetics and socioeconomic status were excluded. 5. Exceptionally high accuracy suggests potential overfitting. 6. MLPNN may be sensitive to hyperparameters and data specifics. 7. Potential issues with missing or inconsistent medical records. 8. Findings may become outdated as health trends evolve. 9. The study identifies correlations, not causal relationships. 10. Lack of validation on external datasets limits generalizability. 11. No clarity in the figures, not formatted the tables. 12. Poor in discussion and results section. 13. References not cited properly.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Pavan Kumar Pagadala**
Department, University & Country	**K L University, Aziz Nagar Campus, India**