



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_40083
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge About Diabetes and Its Effect on Quality of Life Among Diabetic Patients in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Original research paper

**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>)

**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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How was the sample size calculated?</li> <li>2. How were the study participants chosen?</li> <li>3. There is a mismatch in the study area in your abstract and original article (Hospital wards and OPD). Kindly clarify</li> <li>4. What is the operational definition (score) regarding the knowledge and QOL to say that is good &amp; average/ good, moderate &amp; poor? Any references for the scoring?</li> <li>5. In your methodology, Non Saudi was given as exclusion. What is the Non Saudi category in your results? Kindly clarify</li> <li>6. It would be self-explanatory if 'N' is given for each variable in the tables. Eg: Sex (N=300), locality (N=300)</li> <li>7. Is it marital status or martial statue in the results?</li> <li>8. What association have you seen in table 8? What statistical test have you used in Table 8?</li> <li>9. What is the test used in table 9? Mention it below the table.</li> <li>10. In the discussion, it would be better to use the word 'proportion' instead of 'prevalence' as the study is only a single hospital based study and cannot be generalised to the entire population.</li> <li>11. Other limitations? Study cannot be generalised, Study was done only in OPD, more female population,etc</li> <li>12. For references with url address, date of retrieval should be mentioned.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Was the informed consent that was obtained, written or oral? Was confidentiality maintained?</li> <li>2. Mention how data was entered and analysed and what statistical tests were used.</li> <li>3. Would be better if discussion is revised. (Grammatical and spelling errors)</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It would be good if the number of tables is reduced, and only the relevant ones are shown.</li> <li>2. It would be better if there were line diagrams/component bar diagrams for the association of knowledge and QOL with the demographic variables.</li> </ol>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>A. Evangeline Mary</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Community Medicine, Govt. Stanley Medical College, India</b>