



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_46548
Title of the Manuscript:	The relationship between acceptance of illness and quality of life in mothers with gestational diabetes mellitus
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL

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>Abstract: well written</p> <p>Introduction: Comments have been added – the way the Introduction is written could be improved so as to reflect on the objective of the study- state the overall prevalence of GDM, define GDM using accepted definitions and then quote the local prevalence. The main objective for this study is acceptably written.</p> <p>Method: The sample size has been quoted, but reference must be made to the study to justify this number, validation of the tool used (questionnaire) has been added later in the text, best be moved up in the description so as to state that this internationally accepted questionnaire is applicable to the local population. Was a Persian version used and was the questionnaire directly administered to the subjects. Mention is made of an accompanying person, but no mention is made if the subjects were literate enough o answer the posed questions. Some description of this process and how subject were recruited need to be stated. Although consent is taken, subjects need to know if they were willing to participate, and how long it took to complete the questionairres. Studies like this should also make a note of the completeness of data collection in the questionnaire.</p> <p>The statistical methods is acceptable.</p> <p>Results: There are many tables, Table 3 should have a separate heading – see comment. The SD is quoted (replace St). There is no need to state the max and min in the column. The tables are formatted well. Add a subscript when asterisk are used – significance level.</p> <p>Discussion This is generally well handled with suitable references. The conclusion of this study was that majority of subjects had good quality of life but there was no relation between acceptance of illness and QoL. Some mention is made that previous surgery impacted some-what on the QoL. These are areas that would need to be explored in future studies. So it would be good to summarise based on what positive and negative findings were made and then relate the limitations of the study. One of the limitation mentioned in the conclusion is 'low number of subjects in test group'- this contradicts the justification of the sample size used based on a previous study. Some areas that was not explored was the level of education and how patients perceived GDM- did they know the complications; are they aware of the long term complications of the sickness, etc. As this study was done in the antenatal period (most in second trimester,) does this impact on the final results. These may be stated as limitations and recommendations for future studies drawn on gestational age, assessment using the same tool after delivery (when outcome of pregnancy is known , knowledge of short and long term complications) would provide more information which would support the conclusion drawn.</p> <p>References: These should adhere to the guidelines. See comments.</p> <p>- time duration to administer the questionaiire, place it is administered is needed</p>	<p>ALL comments were edited by author</p> <p>ALL comments were edited by author</p> <p>ALL comments were edited by author</p> <p>ALL comments were edited by author</p>
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Overall a well conducted study. The results are drawn from statistical analysis alone; It would be good to add a qualitative component to explore some of the factors that have not been explored using this methodology.	ALL comments were edited by author
----------------------------------	---	---

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>