

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

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

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

| Minor REVISION comments 1. Limitations of the study 2. Measurement units are missing throughout in tables especially in the biochemical tests 3. English language editing is required. Optional/General comments Reviewer Details: Name: Farzana Ganjifrockwala | Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment The manuscript is bit confusing starting from the aim of the study. Please check the following points: Aim of the study should be clear and restructured. The study is supposed to involve newly diagnosed type 2 patients who were either on diet control or on oral antihyperglycemic agents and comparision 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. The newly diagnosed patients are having duration of disease more than 10 years??? Some patients are having complications too as indicated in the table 2 The tables and analysis were more gender based rather than what's been mentioned in the aim. 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 comparision. | 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) | |
|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Reviewer Details: | Minor REVISION comments | Limitations of the study Measurement units are missing throughout in tables especially in the biochemical tests | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Earzana Ganiifrockwala | | |
| | | Human Biology, Walter Sisulu University, South Africa | | |