

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_95105
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF BLOOD GLUCOSE AND MICROALBUMINURIA AMONG SMOKERS IN TIKO HEALTH DISTRICT
Type of the 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) 		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract does not describe the research in general. • Abstract background is too long. • It is not clear in terms of research methods, sampling techniques, and methods of measuring variables, as well as the participants involved. • Title, study objectives and especially - conclusions are less consistent • The conclusion of the study, namely - smokers in Tiko municipality are reported to be affected by both prediabetes and diabetes alongside the presence of albumin in urine - is not in line with the study design (i.e., cross-sectional) and with the aim of the study, which is to determine the prevalence of prediabetes, diabetes, and microalbuminuria among smokers. <p>There was a difference between the participants written in the abstract (100) and the results (88 participants), without any related explanation. No statement: Limitations of the study, Acknowledgments and Conflict of interest</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:

Name:	Nur Samsu
Department, University & Country	Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia