

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_113173
Title of the Manuscript:	Expert opinion on the use of vildagliptin in Indian patients with diabetes mellitus
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This is a timely research as T2DM is a rising issue in the healthcare sector in many countries. Most of the studies are conducted with people having T2DM, however this study is unique as it has been conducted with clinicians who directly involved in the management of T2DM which is a novel aspect of research.</p> <p>The current title given in the manuscript is satisfactory.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>(Please read below) – Go through the manuscript as some errors are highlighted on the script.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of academic writing/scientific writing is fair. Some sentences were too simple and general and were not written in good quality. Technical errors and grammatical errors were also noted throughout. Therefore, it is ideal to have a language check to improve the quality of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modify the <u>last sentence</u> of the introduction chapter. Do not discuss your study tool in the introduction. 2. Please mention the Ethical approval number under the section 2.1 3. Briefly state how did you invite clinicians from all over the country. (what was the method of invitation). Add your method of invitation to section 2.2 4. Please take all the figure titles below the figure. (Not on the top. Usually, the table titles come on the top, but not the figures) 5. Please change the axis title (Y axis) to “No of responses by the clinicians” in all relevant figures. 6. The results chapter is full of figures. Suggest to have at least one table to show the characteristics of the participants of this study (age, qualifications, years of experience, etc.) Remove any figure with less important data. 7. No initials of authors should be used in citations. Please check the citations. 8. Please do not have much of results (in numbers, %) inside the discussion chapter. Then there will be no difference between results and discussion. Get the main idea from the results and discuss. 	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Dinithi Vidanage
Department, University & Country	General Sir John Kotelawala Defence University, Sri Lanka