

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_96568
Title of the Manuscript:	Proposal for Educational Intervention in people living with Type 2 Diabetes and in their family caregiver.
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://journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic taken up in the manuscript is very important, but unfortunately its elaboration and presentation are insufficient. Yes, however, the proposal of educational intervention contained in the title was not presented in the article in a clear and sufficient way. No. Neither the Results section nor the Conclusion section correspond to the presented Objective. That is, no details of the proposed educational intervention were presented. The Abstract section shows only that selected sociodemographic data, anthropometric measurements, blood pressure, and capillary blood samples for glycosylated hemoglobin were collected. Not completely. Both the section on the methodology of the study and the section on the description of the results of the study contain a fragment not applicable to these sections. Only information relevant to the subject matter of these sections should be included in the sections listed. Not completely, because the research methodology was not presented in a reliable and exhaustive way: 1) criteria for inclusion and exclusion from the study, 2) information on how and at what point in the study data on BMI, blood pressure, glycated hemoglobin concentration were obtained, 3) information on who developed the presented education program for the subjects. In addition, the education program presented in Table 4 does not specify what exactly the educational intervention would consist of, who would participate in it (patients or also their families?). The References section is largely comprised of web pages and reports. The share of articles is insignificant. It seems that the References could be supplemented with items concerning, for example, the possibilities and effectiveness of educational programs or various programs to support people with diabetes and their families from other countries. I have added additional comments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please insert explanations of all abbreviations in the first place of their use - The Introduction section is far too long, additionally it contains a lot of epidemiological data unnecessarily. In addition, this section does not introduce the research issues, as it is a text detached from further content. It lacks reference to the issues raised by the authors. - In the section on the methodology of the study, please provide information on the country and date of the study, and how people with diabetes were identified - test results? Patient cards? In addition, there is no clear information on whether the study participants were during the intervention presented by the authors, before it, or after it? - In the Results section in Table 1, not all data add up to 100% (of course, where they should add up to 100%). The financial situation of the study participants presented by the authors is not necessarily understandable to the reader who is not familiar with the realities of life in a given country. Why is this table missing information on BMI, waist circumference and blood pressure of the subjects? - I consider it unnecessary to present the results of the assessment of the knowledge of individual respondents in Table 2. Rather, the results should be grouped and classified according to the number of points obtained. - Table 3, according to the authors, was supposed to present Treatment goals of the participants. But what are these therapeutic goals, since in Table 3 the authors presented the different results of the study participants. The last column in this table is unnecessary. Finally, what do the terms 'good men', 'good women' and 'poor women' in this table mean? - Figure 2 presents the same data as in Table 3 and in the text. However, if the authors had decided to leave the figure, the pie chart would have been clearer - The entire Educational Intervention Proposal section does not meet the criteria to describe the results, rather it should be included in the Discussion section - The footnotes to tables 1, 2, 3 and figure 2 are completely unclear to me ("Direct Source. Own elaboration., Pelcastre et al, 2020") - I am not very familiar with the discussion of the results presented by the authors. The aim of the work was to propose an educational intervention for people with diabetes, while the discussion mainly consists in discussing the results obtained. Additionally, I consider the first paragraph of 	

Review Form 1.7

	this section unjustified – The Conclusions section should concisely present the conclusions drawn directly from the results obtained, and this is not the case with the conclusions included in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I don't feel competent to judge English language and style, but I think a spelling test is required	
Optional/General comments	-	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Malgorzata Stachoń
Department, University & Country	Institute of Human Nutrition Sciences, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland