

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_87126
Title of the Manuscript:	Prospective observational study: Risk factors and outcomes of diabetic foot ulcer among diabetes mellitus patients admitted to Government Medical College, Nizamabad
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In the abstract, the text referring to the objective of the article does not match what was expected. It's part of the introduction. It should be placed in the subtopic "introduction" and formulate the subtopic "objective" according to the text.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the introduction, I advise the use of worldwide statistical data on the subject (diagnoses of diabetes, foot ulcers and hospitalization expenses) to quantify the prevalence of the problem and highlight the importance of research on prevention.2. In the methodology, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were not well defined. It is important to highlight all the criteria, not just those that served to withdraw participants. The more criteria, the more seriousness and reliability of the sample.3. In the discussion, it is not necessary to start by mentioning the research focus (It has already been explained before). It should start by mentioning what was discovered.4. In the conclusions, it was mentioned that most patients had their legs amputated below the ankle, but previously this information was not explicitly developed.5. Bibliographic references with 10 years prior to 2022 must be replaced. Excerpt in cases of guidelines or similar.	
Optional/General comments	The text is well structured, with adequate methodology and has scientific relevance. Congratulations.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Libine Rafel da Silva Calado
Department, University & Country	Brazil