

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_91344
Title of the Manuscript:	Diabetes and daytime sleeping: systematic review
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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>1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "systematic review" may be as "a systematic review"; "part in" as "part of"; "quantitative" as "the quantitative"; "higher" as "a higher"; "night" as "the night"; "central" as "the central"; "being one" as "is one"; "sleep were" as "sleep was"; "specific" as "a specific"; "the validity" as "validity"; "results to" as "results were to"; "Northwest of" as "Northwest"; "serves for" as "serves"; "to JUMC" as "on JUMC"; "routine purpose" as "the routine purposes"; "type 2" as "with type 2"; "poor-sleeper" as "the poor-sleeper"; "good-sleeper" as "the good-sleeper"; "mellitus are" as "mellitus is"; "University" as "the University"; "low" as "a low"; "the sleep" as "sleep"; "with decrease" as "with a decrease"; "the patients" as "patients"; "pancreas" as "the pancreas"; "the rodent" as "rodent"; "a short" as "short"; "higher" as "a higher"; "quality" as "the quality"; "part in" as "part of". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the word "objectives" may be as "objective"; "illness" as "illnesses"; ": this" as ": This"; "reviews" as "review"; "wasextracted" as "was extracted"; "wasapplied" as "was applied"; "articles" as "article"; "Auther" as "Author"; "china" as "China"; "one third" as "one-third"; "Quality index" as "Quality Index"; "discriminate" as "discriminates"; "one month" as "one-month"; "neurotransmitter" as "neurotransmitters"; "when in" as "when at"; "may be" as "may". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, diabetes mellitus, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI), etc.). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated.</p> <p>4. The initial cited with reference in the text should be removed and should be in the author instruction of the journal (For example, "Samantha B. J. Schipper et al, 2021"; "Anitra D M Koopman et al,2019 (15)"; etc.) and it should also be checked all over the manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. In conclusion, it is highly recommended to include weaknesses of the study and potential future research goals based on the review.</p> <p>2. The reference should be cited properly, for example few references are cited with month and year and not for the remaining references and all the references to be corrected as per the journal format in the text also.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The authors have put effort to evaluate the "Diabetes and daytime sleeping: systematic review". The authors describe the review undertaken with this in an organized manner, emphasizing the results obtained by them. The article needs modification for better cohesion of information to achieve the goal and the minor shortcomings which need to be considered. Hence, the paper can be accepted after MINOR REVISIONS are carried out.	

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:	A. Vijaya Anand
Department, University & Country	Bharathiar University, India