



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Experimental Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 91271

Title: Hepatic and renal effects of oral stingless bee honey in a streptozotocin-induced diabetic rat model

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06139840

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-28 06:31

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-30 20:42

Review time: 2 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for asking my opinion about the manuscript entitled "M Histological alteration of kidney and liver with oral Stingless bee honey (SBH) administration in Sprague Dawley induced diabetic rats' model". I believe that this manuscript should be a major revision: Q1. It is very important to change and modify the title. the title is not appropriate. Q2. Are the objectives and the rationale of the study clearly stated? Q3. In the abstract, the research gap was not clearly stated. In addition, the authors need to rewrite the study objectives to be more academic writing Q4. In the introduction, include the study's significance and novelty. What makes the study different from the rest and what does it add to the current knowledge?. Q5. In the introduction, the authors should have explained the purpose of this study and the existing gaps in this field and explained why this study was conducted. Q6. Are the methods clear and replicable? Do all the results presented to match the methods described? Q7. If relevant are the results novel? Does the study provide an advance in the field? Is the data plausible? Q8. References are relevant, correct, and not recent. The number of references should be increased. please add some references. since this is a scientific review, all the

sentences need to be supported with references. This study is very beautiful. I liked the sequence and enjoyed reading. Please add more references on similar studies. Q9. There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed. Q10. What are the limitations of the study? A description of limitations is missing at the end of the discussion section.