



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJBCRR_42976 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | PREDICTORS OF GLYCAEMIC CONTROL AMONG GHANAIAN TYPE 2 DIABETES PATIENTS USING DIABETES SELF-MANAGEMENT APPROACH |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>See numerous comments noted in PDF file.</p> <p>The tables are poorly constructed and not reader friendly at all. Tables will need to be reconstructed in order to make it easier to understand.</p> <p>The results and discussion section must be separated for ease of reading.</p> <p>Refrain from using the word diabetics – this stigmatises patients. rather use the words “patients with diabetes”</p> <p>Avoid use word like mgt – this is a scientific journal – full words essential</p> <p>Refrain from repeating all what you have in the table – only describe pertinent findings</p> <p>Remember to comment on both IDF and WHO guidelines on optimal diabetes control</p> <p>For significance did you use < 0.05 or ≤ 0.05?</p> <p>Try to group findings from developed versus developing countries hence literature review not complete especially from Africa and South Africa in particular</p> <p>P values should be listed as <0.05 not $p=0.000$</p> <p>I would re do discussion making it more reader friendly</p> <p>Ethical issue:</p> <p>Need ethics reference number</p> | <p>Accept reviewer comments and have address all comments appropriately in revised manuscript.</p> <p>Ethics reference number has also been provided in the manuscript. See section 2.3. Ethical consideration. Page 3</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |