

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_102788</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficacy of fixed-dose Combination of Dapagliflozin and Sitagliptin in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus using continuous glucose monitoring: A Real-World Study in India</b>
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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The study is very important for the scientific community</p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>It needs major revision</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First the sample size is small to give a conclusive evidence.</li> <li>2. Randomized controlled study is a better design for efficacy. Single arm cannot be conclusive.</li> <li>3. The study is retrospective in nature, however, it seems that it is prospective from the methods section.</li> <li>4. Four days of reading the CGM is not enough for baseline assessment.</li> <li>5. P value is not enough, 95% confidence interval is better</li> </ol>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Editing by native speaker is needed.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This study aimed to assess the efficacy of a fixed-dose combination (FDC) of dapagliflozin and sitagliptin in Indian patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). The study was a single-arm, single-center, real-world study that included 28 T2DM patients who were not achieving optimal glycemic control with their current therapy. Patients were administered a continuous glucose monitoring system (CGMS) along with the FDC of dapagliflozin and sitagliptin. The study found a statistically significant improvement in average daily glucose (ADG), time in target (TIT), and time above target (TAT) but an increase in time below target (TBT). The study concluded that the FDC of dapagliflozin and sitagliptin significantly improves AGD, TIT, and TAT at the end of 15 days in Indian T2DM patients.	
----------------------------------	--	--

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emad R Issak</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ain Shams University, Egypt</b>