

## Editorial Comments:

### REVISION COMMENTS:

- Your title has to contain 'people with and without type 2 diabetes' since they are your participants. If you can't fit in the words 'their offspring', please leave it in its original format (i.e. Relationship of the Self-perception of Lifestyle with Level of Physical Activity in People with and without Type 2 Diabetes), then make it clear in the method section that participants without T2D were the offspring. Also justify why the offspring were chosen. **Corrected**
- Merge the design and location to form part of the methodology in the abstract. Also remove 'mutual aid group' in the abstract as it does not describe a location. Then re-organise this statement from the abstract method to avoid tautology; 'Descriptive statistics were used for sociodemographic variables, frequencies and percentages for categorical, mean and standard deviation for quantitative variables'. This is because frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation are all elements of descriptive statistic, so you may say something like 'Descriptive statistics were used for analysis. Then if you wish to expand it, specify where percentages/frequencies OR mean/standard deviations were used. Same thing applies to the statistical analysis section in the method section. **Corrected**
- Give a few relevant demographic results before the main findings in the abstract. **Added some sociodemographic results.**
- Your abstract conclusion is a repetition of the result. You need to revise it. From the results you found, what do you want to tell readers about type 2 diabetic status and perception of lifestyles/physical activities? **I changed the conclusion**
- Your introduction has multiple paragraphs. Merge them to not more than 4 paragraphs that makes most sense. **Corrected. I prefer short paragraphs because large paragraphs is more probable that could to be detected as plagiarism.**
- In the main methodology section, remove 'Place/Universe of the study' and use a usual term such as 'study location' or 'study setting'. **Corrected**
- Signing an informed consent is not a 'selection criteria', but a step after selecting eligible participants; just like you explained under '2.6 procedure'. Merge all the elements of participants selection (2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4) under one heading '2.4 Selection of Participants'. **Corrected. Always I included that statement because they did not signed the informed consent, they did not participate in the study.**
- You do not need to define sociodemographic variable as they are known terms to all researchers. You only need to define variables specific to your research (independent/dependent) i.e. self-perception and physical activity. **Corrected**
- Change 2.5 heading from questionnaires to 'Data collection instruments'. Also, include a statement to show how you estimated the reliability of 0.9 and 0.89. **Corrected**
- In the sub-section 'procedure' – correct the last sentence by replacing the word 'apply' to 'administer' and put 'measure' before anthropometry as you cannot apply anthropometry **Corrected**
- Your sub-heading on 'sample size' need to come before 'sampling' and you need to **specifically** state the sample size of your study i.e. number of participants. Also, the sample size paragraph is too long to be in one sentence with only one full stop. At least make it in two clear sentences. **There are two sections (sampling and sample size; I consider that there are different)**
- In the sub-heading 2.8 – the word '**análisis**' is not an English word. Correct it. The first sentence of this section should be corrected as suggested in the abstract. **Corrected**
- Separate the heading 'Results and discussion'. Put the sub-heading 'Discussion' after the result section. **In template from the journal Results and Discussion are together**
- Tables 1 and 2 should be merged as they are all sociodemographic variables and quantitative data. Range is not important if you have mean and standard deviation. Arrange all the demography in one table. Those with frequency and % put them in one cell as f(%) while those

with mean/standard deviation put them as Mean  $\pm$  SD. Below is a **SAMPLE** demography table that contains frequency, percentage, mean and SD, among two groups of participants. You may use something similar and ignore the p value column. **Corrected**

- The results description need to be revised interms of the language. Phrases like ‘where THEY NAMED female..’ and ‘individual with marital status married to..’ in the first part of the result has to be re-structured using academic writing. Using words like ‘THROWING a value of p...’ is completely inappropriate in academic writing. Similar cases across all the result description needs to be revised accordingly. **Corrected**
- Your presentation of ‘odds ratio’ is poor. Confidence interval are presented as ‘CI’ not ‘IC’ and i don’t know what you mean by ‘a’ in ‘95%IC = 0.80 a 10.4’. If at all you must use ‘odds ratio’, it has to be for both table 4 and table 5, not only table 5 as you did. You must also check your OR calculation as the OR of 2.85 at 95% CI(0.80 to 10.4) is not a statistically significant finding because the lower CI is below 1.0. **OR is an effect measure; if there is not relationship is not useful calculate the strenght of association. Corrected some parts**
- Check the figures in all the tables for accuracy, because table 5 has a total of 103 participants instead of 100. **Corrected**
- You should start your discussion by given overview/summary of your findings before you start citing other studies. Also minimise use of unnecessary paragraphs in the discussion and merge small paragraphs. Your ‘study weakness’ at the end of the discussion makes little saense. Re-structure it. **Corrected**
- **Please get somebody with strong English background to proofread and accordingly revise the whole manuscript after the corrections. There are so many grammatical errors, particular relating to verb-noun agreement and use of punctuation marks.**

**Sample Table: Sociodemographic characteristics of participants (N=130)**

Variable	Total Sample (N=130, 100%)	NPW (n=65, 50%)	HPW (n=65, 50%)	p-value (x <sup>2</sup> test)
<b>Age (years)</b>				
Mean $\pm$ SD	26.18 $\pm$ 5.4	27 $\pm$ 5.3	24.82 $\pm$ 5.2	0.209
<b>Educational Level (n, %)</b>				
Non-formal education	79(60.8)	34(52.3)	45(69.2)	0.059
Primary education	21(16.2)	16(24.6)	5(7.7)	
Secondary education	19(14.6)	9(13.8)	10(15.4)	
Tertiary education	11(8.5)	6(9.2)	5(7.7)	
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Hausa	12(9.2)	4(6.2)	8(12.3)	0.341
Margi	7(5.4)	4(6.2)	3(4.6)	
Babur	13(10)	5(7.7)	8(12.3)	
Kanuri	70(53.8)	34(52.3)	36(55.4)	
Others	28(21.5)	18(27.7)	10(15.4)	
<b>Gestational Age (months)</b>				
Mean ( $\pm$ SD)	7.2 $\pm$ 0.67	7.63 $\pm$ 0.63	7.82 $\pm$ 0.71	0.230
<b>Parity Status (n, %)</b>				
Nulliparous	24(18.5)	12(18.5)	12(18.5)	1.000
Multiparous	106(81.5)	53(81.5)	53(81.5)	

Please take your time to revise the manuscript. The above comments need to be extensively reviewed before it is considered for publication with this journal.

**Author's Feedback:**

All changes are in green