

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123345
Title of the Manuscript:	Chronic Care Model Impact on Type 2 Diabetes Care in Primary Care Setting in the Gulf Countries: A Scoping Literature Review
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Chronic Care Model (CCM) employs a systematic approach to restructuring the primary healthcare system. There are documented evidences that CCM can reduce HbA1c and other clinical outcomes in persons with type 2 diabetes compared to the usual care in primary healthcare settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive enough	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure appropriate	
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.	The study used appropriate and scientific method Comprehensive literature search Appropriate presentation of findings	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	References are sufficient but Some not complete (Ref: 24 (no journal name &date), 27(no journal name), 23(no journal name) 7(no journal name), 6(no journal name &ref not current) Some not current (Ref: 17(2010), 28(2003),14(2010),13(2005),10(2006),9(2002),6(2013), 4(2003), 2(2011). Current journals should not be older than 10yrs Authors may wish to include more current journals if there are.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality suitable for scholarly communication	
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:	Abatur Suleiyol Charity Uadoo
Department, University & Country	Federal Medical Center, Nigeria