



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_50966
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship of the Self-perception of Lifestyle with Level of Physical Activity in People with and without Type 2 Diabetes
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Relationship of the Self-perception of Lifestyle with Level of Physical Activity in People with and without Type 2 Diabetes</p> <p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The subject is interesting. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p>Abstract: "Mesico" is misspelled.</p> <p>-Sample and sample size Please provide a flowchart.</p> <p>An opportunistic sample can be acceptable if is clearly stated and the limitations of data are taken into account. When convenience sampling is used, it is necessary to describe how the sample of the current investigation would be different from the ideal sample, selected randomly (from the entire population). It is also necessary to describe individuals who might be left out during the selection process or individuals who are over-represented in the sample.</p> <p>Title and Discussion: It seems that the study is conducted in "in people with T2D and their offspring without T2D." This fact is important and should be made explicit in the title (it is not about "any person" without TD2, but descendants of diabetic people). This circumstance of being the "controls of diabetics" family/descendants of diabetic people can be a confounding variable for the interpretation of the results (both in the comparison between diabetics and non-diabetics, as in the group of non-diabetics who are "special" people -descendants, and therefore cohabiting, caregivers, etc. of diabetic people). This limitation should be commented, and this "special" comparison should be shown in the title.</p> <p>Results and Abstract: The authors write: "the level of physical activity in people without type 2 diabetes, this is because people without type 2 diabetes are more aware of their perception of lifestyle." However, the study design does not allow finding causality; all the most association between variables. It must be rewritten.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: Except in qualitative studies, the usual rule is to write the Results and Discussion sections separately (where results are no longer repeated).</p> <p>-Tables: In dichotomous variables (such as Yes / No), just it is enough write one of the two possibilities (obviously the rest is the other value of the variable).</p> <p>-Discussion: The Discussion is poor. It must be improved. The review of the literature should be more than cite the results of other authors. It should also be discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these studies, which should be provided a picture, albeit limited, of the state of knowledge and the main questions on the</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>subject that these studies clarify and left unclear (e.g. by inadequate samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, characteristics of the persons studied, etc.).</p> <p>-References: References are poor in quality. They must be improved</p> <p>The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals</p> <p>-Keywords: For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Jose Luis Turabian
Department, University & Country	Spain