

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_124067
Title of the Manuscript:	Chronic Disease Management in Nursing: A Comprehensive Review of Diabetes Mellitus
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript clearly outlines a comprehensive review of the role of nurses in managing diabetes mellitus, a chronic and globally prevalent disease, the paper makes a valuable contribution to the scientific community as it emphasizes the changing duties of nurses in patient education, self-management assistance, and the utilization of technology such as continuous glucose monitoring and telehealth. Through the examination of obstacles encountered in the management of diabetes, such as patient non-adherence and limitations in healthcare resources, this review provides valuable perspectives on enhancing nursing approaches. The review further underscores the need of ongoing innovation and education in nursing, hence promoting improved patient care and superior clinical results, rendering it a valuable asset for both research and clinical practice in the management of chronic diseases.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title expresses what the manuscript is about, clearly indicating the focus on chronic disease management and nursing. It highlights the importance of the study by addressing diabetes mellitus, a major health concern. The current title does not contain unnecessary description but could be refined for better specificity.</p> <p>An alternative title is not necessary, but the Author could consider: "Nursing Strategies in Diabetes Mellitus Management: A Comprehensive Review of Patient-centred Care and Technological Innovation"</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract serves as a useful introduction, however it lacks sufficient information on the methodologies, results, and conclusions to autonomously present a comprehensive summary of the work.</p> <p>Some recommendation below will help to strengthen the abstract:</p> <p>Include Key Methods: Briefly mention how the review was conducted, such as the use of literature analysis or case studies. For example: "This review is based on an analysis of current literature and selected case studies on nursing practices in diabetes management."</p> <p>Highlight Key Findings: The abstract should mention specific findings from the review, such as any significant trends in nursing strategies or innovations in patient care. "The review identifies the growing use of telehealth and continuous glucose monitoring as key innovations improving patient outcomes."</p> <p>Add Conclusions: The abstract should conclude with a statement about the overall impact or recommendations drawn from the review. "The findings emphasize the need for continuous professional development for nurses to adapt to new technologies and approaches in diabetes care."</p> <p>Consider Removing General Statements: Phrases like "Nurses play a crucial role..." are well-known and could be streamlined to focus on specific insights from the review.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is logical and flows well. The subsections are appropriately placed, allowing for a coherent discussion of various aspects of diabetes management in nursing. However, certain sections could be expanded or subdivided for clarity, particularly:</p> <p>"Role of Nursing in Chronic Disease Management" could benefit from breaking into specific categories of nursing responsibilities.</p> <p>"Challenges in Diabetes Management" could be subdivided into specific types of challenges, such as patient adherence and resource limitations.</p> <p>"Case Studies in Nursing and Diabetes Management" should include more detail on how the case studies were selected and analysed.</p> <p>Further feedback: The manuscript addresses an important topic regarding, "Chronic Disease Management in Nursing: A Comprehensive Review of Diabetes Mellitus". It provides a solid review of the subject but could be improved by adding more specificity and detail, especially in the methods, results, and conclusion sections. The inclusion of tables, figures, and clearer subsections would make the paper more accessible and engaging for the reader.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of the critical role nurses play in managing diabetes mellitus, detailing their contributions in patient education, medication management, lifestyle interventions, and technology integration. The discussion and conclusion sections are scientifically</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>robust, reflecting a thorough understanding of current practices and challenges in diabetes care. The manuscript is technically sound, underpinned by a solid framework of nursing interventions and future directions.</p> <p>However, to enhance its impact, the manuscript could benefit from incorporating specific data and examples that illustrate the effectiveness and challenges of nursing interventions. A more detailed exploration of health disparities and resource limitations, along with concrete examples of successful strategies and implementation plans, would strengthen the discussion and provide a clearer roadmap for future research and practice improvements. Overall, the manuscript effectively underscores the importance of continued innovation and education in advancing diabetes care.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The reference section of the manuscript is comprehensive and includes many relevant and recent studies that support the discussion on diabetes management and nursing interventions. However, it would benefit from the inclusion of foundational and seminal research to provide historical context and support for key concepts. Additionally, citing original research papers rather than reviews for specific findings would strengthen the evidence base. Ensuring that the most recent and influential studies are included will further enhance the manuscript's representation of current knowledge in the field. Overall, the references are well-chosen but could be improved by addressing these gaps and incorporating a broader range of sources.</p> <p>Primary Source Citations: In some instances, such as when discussing the prevalence of diabetes complications, it would be more impactful to cite original research studies rather than reviews. For instance, rather than citing a review on complications of diabetes (e.g., Reference 10), it would be beneficial to include original studies that first identified these complications.</p> <p>Current Knowledge Representation:</p> <p>Recent Developments: The references are generally up to date, but a few key recent publications or guidelines might be missing. For example, the latest consensus guidelines or recent landmark studies from 2023 and 2024 on diabetes management or nursing interventions could be included to ensure the representation of the most current knowledge.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is generally clear and conveys the intended messages effectively. • The manuscript maintains a formal academic tone appropriate for scholarly communication. • Technical terms are used correctly, and the overall structure of sections is logical and well-organized. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and Precision: Some sentences could benefit from more specific language to avoid ambiguity. • Grammar and Syntax: While generally correct, minor revisions could enhance conciseness and flow. • Consistency: Ensure that all references are consistently cited and matched with the text. • Readability: Simplify complex sentences to improve overall readability and comprehension. <p>Example: "Nurses must continuously work to reinforce the importance of adherence and provide strategies to overcome these barriers." Recommendation: Improve readability by breaking complex sentences into simpler ones. For example, "Nurses must continually emphasize the importance of adherence. They also provide strategies to help patients overcome these barriers." Example Regarding consistency: "Through these interventions, nurses help patients achieve better blood glucose control, reduce the risk of complications, and improve their overall quality of life [18]." Recommendation: Ensure consistency in referencing. For example, if [18] refers to a previous section, check that all references are correctly matched and consistently formatted. Example Regarding academic tone: "Maintaining lifestyle changes can be challenging, especially over the long term." Recommendation: Maintain a formal tone by rephrasing as, "Sustaining lifestyle changes presents significant challenges, particularly over extended periods." Example regarding Grammer and Syntax: "Nurses play a key role in helping patients incorporate these technological tools into their daily care." Recommendation: This sentence is clear but could be slightly more concise. Consider rephrasing to, "Nurses play a crucial role in integrating these technological tools into patients' daily care routines."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Coenrad Adolph Groenewald</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>South Africa</p>