

## 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> )

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

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript has needs improvement for appropriate scientific.</li> <li>2. Title is an overstatement when any study is done without comparator and without taking care of confounding factors.</li> <li>3. Abstract is comprehensive as per the content of manuscript.</li> <li>4. Subsections and structure are appropriate.</li> <li>5. Manuscript needs a lot of improvement for being scientifically appropriate to deliver right message. Trial design has not considered confounding factors, like use of CGMS itself leads to improvement in glucose profile over time due to its impact on lifestyle interventions. Impact of CGMS in absence of the additional drug should be used for comparison. Similarly, this manuscript specifically says that FDC of Sita+ Dapa is helpful, which is once again is an overstatement and can be interpreted as effect of FDC is better than drugs given individually.</li> <li>6. Okay.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Ethical approval is needed even in retrospective study for the use of data. This is wrong concept that ethical approval is not needed. Informed consent from participants may not be mandatory for such studies, however, ethical approval should be sufficient.	

### **PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kumar Prafull Chandra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Chandra Diabetes Clinic, India</b>