



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_44534
Title of the Manuscript:	Causes and Concerns of diabetic subjects with lower limb amputation(s) in Trinidad
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	1. Reason (s) for hospital selection? Can the author provide brief description of the hospitals mentioned in the study? Do these hospitals represent a particular place in the island nation of Trinidad? 2. In relation to #1, can the author elaborate on line #75 - random stratified methodology? 3. Table 2 - diet and lifestyle were mentioned in the results and conclusion however it was not discussed. I think the fact that the subjects were diabetic, their diet and lifestyle are vital in the discussion. 4. There are some vague statements e.g # 184-185 " when infected of injured"?, # 215-217 "possibility existed that they required support □ financially or emotionally previously and were now getting the required attention due to their ".....?" 5. Further discussion on lifestyle and high % of foot lesions□, does their work, lifestyle contributes to high incidence of foot lesions? Since the patient are diabetic, how come prevention of foot lesions are not implemented? Is it part of culture perhaps? 6. Better to add ethics permit number, code or series in the methodology? 7. Line # 226 - knowledge was mention... can the author elaborate on this because it was stated but it was not reflected in the data results? 8. Line # 35 Narayananing should be Cawich et al based on list of references 9. Line #237 should be "The economic impact of..." 10. Line 245 et all should be deleted and all authors should be cited 11. Line # 81 correlation was mentioned in the methodology but variables were not correlated in the results and discussion	1. Data was collected from patients attending major clinics and admitted in Port of Spain General Hospital (POSGH), San Fernando General Hospital (SFGH), and Eric Williams Medical Sciences Complex Hospital (EWMSC). These are the major hospitals of Northern, Southern and Western regional health authorities of Trinidad. 2. Sorry it was an error. This study mainly comprised patients who were subject to or will be subject to LEAs of differing degrees and these patients were selected randomly. 3. Included as per the suggestion 4. It is not necessary and we have deleted this statement 215-217: sentence changed as : Only few among the selected patients were happy of their outcome because they started getting required attention due to their disability. 5. It is part of their culture 6. Included 7. This is not required here and we have deleted this to avoid the repetition 8. you are correct and we have corrected it 9. modified as per the suggestions 10. Done as per the suggestion 11. It was an error and we have corrected this
Minor REVISION comments	1. Line # 116 - how many patients did not monitor their situation? 2. Line #135 - most were sad.. how about those who were not sad? how many in terms of % or number and reason (s) why they were able to cope? 3. Line # 137 - any idea with regards to the source of their information? 4. Line# 66 - elaborate importance of examining concerns of patients 5. In the abstract, LEA should be stated as lower extremities amputation 6. Line # 54 (LEA) lower limb amputation should be lower extremities amputation	1. 12 patients 2. 2 (7.5%) happy with the outcome of the amputation. Because they were suffering lot with infection Fig 3 give the details 3. Please see the revised article 4. The general concerns of the patients can be investigated through the survey using the questionnaire 5. Done 6. done
Optional/General comments	The study is interesting. Results may be used by the government or non-government organizations in finding solutions or strategies to ease burden of patients and also prevent Db in the long term. Diet and lifestyle must be explained/discussed much further in the study.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	