

1. **Response to Reviewers:**

The authors did not adequately address the reviewers' concerns. A proper response should include a point-by-point reply to each comment, clearly indicating how each issue was resolved. Additionally, revisions in the manuscript should be highlighted—preferably using a different font or color—to make them easily identifiable.

2. **Cattle Link and Unsupported Claims:**

Reviewer 1 raised a valid concern regarding the cattle link, which remains insufficiently justified in the revised manuscript. Furthermore, the paper contains problematic assertions. For instance, the authors claim:

*“Genetic research reveals deep-rooted connections among Irish, Italian, and African populations, challenging simplistic racial divisions (Irish et al., 2020)”* (p. 9).

However, upon reviewing Irish et al. (2020), the cited study actually states that *“dental nonmetric traits can serve as proxies for neutral genomic data,”* which does not support the authors' claim.

3. **AI-Generated Style and Lack of Citations:**

The manuscript reads as though it may have been generated by AI, with limited attention to factual accuracy. For example, the statement:

*“The question of why Irish and Italian communities often deny their historical ties with Africa is rooted in a blend of historical, socio-cultural, and political factors”*

is presented without any supporting citations or references, which is characteristic of AI-generated content lacking scholarly rigor.

4. **Reference Inconsistencies:**

There are notable inconsistencies in the formatting of references. For example, *Antonio, M. L. et al.* is listed in one format, while *De Franceschi, L., Castiglioni, C., Condorelli, C., Valsecchi, D., Premoli, E., Fiocchi, C., & Perrone, V.* appears in another. Additionally, some titles are missing or truncated, which undermines the credibility of the reference list.

5. **Overall Assessment:**

Although I do not have a background in genetics, the recurring issues—lack of proper responses, unsupported claims, citation errors, and questionable authorship—lead me to conclude that the manuscript does not meet the standards required for publication.