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|  | 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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript provides a comprehensive exploration of non-type 1 and 2 diabetes mellitus, with a particular focus on neonatal diabetes mellitus (NDM). It addresses critical aspects such as clinical presentation, diagnosis, genetic evaluation, and management strategies, which are essential for advancing understanding in this specialized field. The inclusion of genetic insights and innovative therapeutic approaches, such as insulin pumps and sulfonylurea therapy, underscores its value to clinicians and researchers alike. By highlighting the complexities of NDM and differentiating it from other diabetes forms, this work contributes significantly to improving patient outcomes and guiding future research efforts. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title "Non-type 1 and 2 Diabetes Mellitus" is somewhat broad and may not fully convey the specific focus of the manuscript on neonatal diabetes mellitus (NDM) and other related monogenic forms of diabetes. A more precise title would better reflect the manuscript's content and its contribution to the scientific community.  Suggested alternative title: "Neonatal and Monogenic Forms of Diabetes Mellitus: Clinical Insights and Genetic Approaches Beyond Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes" |  |
| 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 manuscript does not include an abstract, which is an essential component for any scholarly work. An abstract provides a concise summary of the key points and objectives of the research, offering readers a clear understanding of the manuscript's content. It is recommended that the authors include a well-structured abstract that highlights the main themes, methods, findings, and significance of the study, particularly focusing on neonatal diabetes and monogenic forms of diabetes mellitus, to enhance the manuscript's accessibility and impact. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript generally presents accurate and relevant scientific information regarding non-Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes mellitus, with a specific focus on neonatal diabetes and monogenic forms such as Maturity-Onset Diabetes of the Young (MODY). However, there are a few areas where additional clarification or references to recent studies could enhance the scientific rigor. For example, while genetic mutations associated with neonatal diabetes and MODY are mentioned, a more detailed exploration of the underlying molecular mechanisms and recent advancements in genetic testing would improve the manuscript's depth. Additionally, some of the diagnostic and therapeutic approaches could be updated to reflect the latest clinical guidelines and practices. Overall, the manuscript is scientifically correct but would benefit from incorporating the most current research to ensure its accuracy and relevance in the field. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and cover a range of important topics related to non-Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes mellitus, including neonatal diabetes, MODY, and genetic testing. However, some of the references are from earlier publications (e.g., 2001, 2008, 2009), which may not reflect the latest advancements in the field. To strengthen the manuscript, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies and reviews, particularly those from the last five years, to ensure the information is up-to-date.  Some suggested references to consider could include:  Latest advancements in genetic testing for MODY (e.g., Butnariu, L. I., Bizim, D. A., Oltean, C., Rusu, C., Pânzaru, M. C., Păduraru, G., ... & Trandafir, L. M. (2024). The Importance of Molecular Genetic Testing for Precision Diagnostics, Management, and Genetic Counseling in MODY Patients. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 25(12), 6318.‏  Current clinical guidelines on the management of neonatal diabetes (e.g., publications from the American Diabetes Association or the International Diabetes Federation in 2023 or 2024).  Recent reviews on the pathophysiology and treatment of monogenic diabetes (e.g.,Zhang, H., Colclough, K., Gloyn, A. L., & Pollin, T. I. (2021). Monogenic diabetes: a gateway to precision medicine in diabetes. The Journal of clinical investigation, 131(3).‏  Including these newer references would help provide a more comprehensive overview of the current state of research in this field. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the manuscript is generally clear and understandable, but there are several areas where improvement is needed to enhance readability and precision. Some sentences are lengthy and may benefit from being broken down into simpler structures for better clarity. Additionally, there are occasional issues with grammar, punctuation, and word choice that could hinder the flow of the text. |  |
| Optional/Generalcomments | Overall, the manuscript presents an important and insightful exploration of neonatal diabetes and non-type 1 and 2 diabetes mellitus. The inclusion of clinical presentation, diagnosis, management strategies, and genetic considerations offers a comprehensive perspective on the topic. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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: | **Fayrouz Alzobair Khalid** |
| Department, University & Country | **Omar El –Mukhtar University, Libya** |