



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJMMR_29418</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Follow up Type 2 diabetes mellitus: a comparison between intensive diet, physical exercise and lifestyle intervention with medication controlled management</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research paper</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is bit confusing starting from the aim of the study. Please check the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aim of the study should be clear and restructured.</li> <li>2. The study is supposed to involve newly diagnosed type 2 patients who were either on diet control or on oral antihyperglycemic agents and comparison between two modes of treatment over a year. But this objective has not met anywhere in the manuscript except for figure 1 but still it shows 6 months follow-up.</li> <li>3. The newly diagnosed patients are having duration of disease more than 10 years???</li> <li>4. Some patients are having complications too as indicated in the table 2</li> <li>5. The tables and analysis were more gender based rather than what's been mentioned in the aim.</li> <li>6. The statistical analysis should have been carried out for six groups as mentioned in figure1 throughout instead of making it a gender based study and comparison.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aim of the study re-written clear and restructured.</li> <li>2. The study design re-stated and we have deleted the term involve newly diagnosed type 2. The Figure 1 corrected it shows 12 months follow-up.</li> <li>3. The newly diagnosed patients removed and duration remaining as it is.</li> <li>4. It is true, there are some patients are having complications too as indicated in the table 2.</li> <li>5. We agree with the reviewer that the tables and analysis were more gender based rather than what's been mentioned in the aim. Therefore we re-stated the title of manuscripts and aim of study accordingly.</li> <li>6. The statistical analysis has been conducted according to the gender groups. .Figure 1 indicates that patients achieved target HbA1c &lt; 7% in mean reduction according to treatment group after 12 months.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Limitations of the study</li> <li>2. Measurement units are missing throughout in tables especially in the biochemical tests</li> <li>3. English language editing is required.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		