

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology.
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_94219
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Older Age Diabetes in Rural Area of North-West Region of Bangladesh
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:

(<https://www.journaljamr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The statement saying "Bangladesh's north-west region consistently has worse health results than the rest of the nation" very strong words...it needs rely evidences unless it's a very strong claim with out evidences. Moreover the gap shows over all age groups with the chronic diseases " Many chronic illnesses, including diabetes, which is the seventh biggest cause of mortality in Bangladesh, fall under this category" but the objectives tilted to only old age group,,,so the gap should be specific more,,, <p>Method.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study design, sample size and study time were not included under the method session. <p>Result</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "When compared to the Urban reference group"...what the interested parameter compared with urban. Should include. Also the study unit should be included in the explaining of the results. What are the courses increased DM in old...being rural or aged <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is not clear and not understandable as per of the result <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ In the introduction part the authors tried to introduce the terms and interested parameters but lack of gap this research going to fill. Already explain the facts and tell the research outcome. ✓ Lack of evidences package and direction to produce the gap analysis ✓ Over all the introduction part is poorly written in flow of idea...punctuation. Grammar. <p>Methods and materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Under methods this all should be included according to the journal guide line The study design, sample size, how to reach the study unit procedures, exclusion criteria and inclusion ethical clearance, consent form. What are the required tools and reagents required for this study highly needed to be included? ✓ "Using a negative binomial regression, differences in the prevalence of diagnosed diabetes were evaluated" How this included under study population? ✓ statically analysis poorly written ...need edition critically <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ the text should not be doubly of the table, include only main points and show the table at the last of the text .include the frequency in table one its represented only by present. ✓ The table heading should include the study place and year ✓ Many associated factors have been included in the analysis but how they were measured by whom they were measured should include in the Methods section, ✓ How would you control the cofounders and adjust the model should also include in the methods very well. ✓ In results of table two ** and * indicated . should include at the footer of the table or make one more column and include the P-value as per the journal guide line <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The discussion session is where the authors synthesize the results very well and in discuss with comparisons...justification and further discuss the discrepancies. The discussion lack this all. Need to rewrite all important out comes and independent variables ✓ In discussion the strength and limitation of the stud should also include. ✓ Over all the discussion needs rewriting as per the journal guide line to make it scientific <p>References are highly remixed up style .need carful revision per journal guide line</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The grammar, statements flow, paragraph flow...ideas flow. punctuations are not carefully addressed. Over all writes up need revision. Even though it seems minor is very meaningful and have sound in scientific writing.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The manuscript seems mini. Need edition on the all sections of the skeleton of the manuscript presented and missed also. Even the title should include all out come s in analysis as risk. Or associated factors. 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Belay Zawdie
Department, University & Country	Jimma University, Ethiopia