

**Editorial Process:** I conducted a thorough review of the revised manuscript, carefully examined both peer reviewers' detailed comments (Reviewer 1: 8/10, minor revision recommended; Reviewer 2: 7.5/10, major revision recommended), and closely considered the handling editor's substantive concerns regarding academic integrity and scholarly standards before reaching my editorial decision.

**Review Summary:** This manuscript underwent standard peer review with two external reviewers plus handling editor evaluation. While the topic addresses an interesting interdisciplinary question, multiple serious issues prevent publication.

**Critical Issues Identified:**

1. **Academic Integrity Violation:** Source misrepresentation detected. Author cites Irish et al. (2020) claiming it supports "deep-rooted connections among Irish, Italian, and African populations" when the source only discusses dental traits as genomic proxies. This constitutes misrepresentation of scholarly sources.
2. **Misleading Title:** Title promises "African Lineage" evidence, but research shows minimal African ancestry in Irish populations and modest signals (1-3%) in Southern Italy. Content supports "connections" not "lineage."
3. **Substandard Scholarly Practice:**
  - Unsupported claims without citations
  - Inconsistent reference formatting
  - Suspected AI-generated content with limited author oversight
  - Inadequate response to peer review process
4. **Review Process Issues:** Author failed to provide point-by-point reviewer responses or highlight manuscript revisions as required.

**Editorial Assessment:** Despite reviewers' relatively positive scores, the handling editor's identification of source misrepresentation represents a fundamental academic integrity violation that supersedes other considerations. Combined with additional scholarly deficiencies, this manuscript does not meet our publication standards.