

Journal Name: <u>Journal of Disease and Global Health</u>

Manuscript Number: Ms_JODAGH_12618

Title of the Manuscript: NANOTECHNOLOGY THERAPY FOR T2DM: CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES, 2024

Type of the Article Review Article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only based on 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer thinks is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.ikprress.org/index.php/index/editorial-guideline)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable?		

(If not please suggest an alternative title)	
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.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Reviewer Comments:	
	 In most of references page numb mentioned. 	pers are not
	2. References are not written in pro	per manner.
	Names of journals are written in a expanded form, should be correct.	
	 The content seems interesting bugrammatical mistakes observed, corrected. 	
	5. Write references citation in prope	er manner.
PART 2:	·	
	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer,

PART 2:	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	write his/her feedback here)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr Vikrant Nikam
Department, University & Country	Amrutvahini College of Pharmacy, India