

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_90258
Title of the Manuscript:	New Advances in Diabetes Care Group Education Research
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Title: It looks like review article.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, entire study looks like quasi experimental study or descriptive cross-sectional study (observational study). Researcher has a scope to reconfirm and state the method by having insight into aim, assumptions and hypothesis of the study. • If it is experimental study, independent and dependent variable should be reflected in the title. • If it is comparative study title should reflect the study variable. <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aim- Add variables and population • Method- Correct grammatical errors. Concentrate on research terminology and mention of appropriate research method • Conclusion- Avoid mention of "Quality of life" as it doesn't seem to be a part of the study. <p>Key terms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use MeSH terms • There is no mention of "nursing" in entire document though it has written as key word. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to improve on justifying the need for providing health education by using group approach. • Relevance of topic to nurses/ in nursing need to be mentioned to justify Nursing as appropriate key word. • Provide clarity: what researcher want to focus on... importance of health education or importance of group approach while delivering health education? schedule of group health education approach. Based on this, your control group and interventional group or comparative group will vary. • In first case there should be two groups, control group who is not receiving package of health education and interventional group who is receiving package health education services. In second case control group with package of health education services by using individual approach and interventional group with where package of health education services provided by using group approach. • If it is comparative study, mention the basis of comparison. <p>Research methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires clarity in research method/research design and same should reflect in abstract and main content. It is not clear: descriptive survey/ quasi experimental study. It looks data was collected one time and during analysis it is compared on the basis of intervention not received at all or received once to complete 9 days. • Provide clarity on: • -Independent variable- how often, how much duration, method of delivery and its sequence of activity with timeline, by whom, defaulter identification and reason for default. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - outcome/ dependent variable – how often, tool for assessment, plan for analysis. • Data is tabulated and compared between two groups made on the basis of those who do not received the group health education and those who received group health education once or more than once. The range of intervention is too high (attended once to attended 9 times) to classify them in one category. There is going to be difference in the outcomes who attended all group health education sessions and attended one-two, 3-4 or less than 8 times. Hence, categorization and comparison of data for analysis need to be rethought and presented. • Were there defaulters? and if yes, reason need to be mentioned. <p>Result</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of participants in control and interventional group (n) should be mentioned in the text and in 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>each figure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title of the figure should show whether it is pretest or baseline data / post test or endline data / difference between pretest and post test. Or just one time data compared between two groups. Label the data of the table appropriately with unit score. Socio-demographic, medical and diabetes literacy profile of the participants should be presented in the tabular form. Data on status of completion of intervention (total 0-9 sessions of group health education services) should be provided and studied for its association. Rethink about subtitles of result and title of the figures viz “<i>foot management and control comparison</i>” Mention the unit of y axis. Providing figure number and mentioning in the text will help in comprehension <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be discussed in contest to the findings of sociodemo data, medical data, independent and outcome variable and in comparison. There is scope to improve in this section. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrict conclusion to your study findings only. eg. “Knowledge” was neither the outcome variable of the present study nor any tool was used to assess the knowledge score. Hence, mention of “improvement in the knowledge” will be overstatement of conclusion. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve on grammar and use of appropriate research terms. Few eg. From your article: <i>Convenient nearby sampling</i>. Word <i>nearby</i> is not used in sampling technique. <i>Questionnaire survey</i>. There is no such term <i>questionnaire survey</i>. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jyoti Chaudhari</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>MGM Institute of Health Sciences, India</p>