



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_48860
Title of the Manuscript:	Diabetic Foot and Self-Awareness of This Entity
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key words must be 5-10 in number in MeSH terms other than those found in title in alphabetical order. Results and discussion must be in separate sections. References are not up to date. In text citations of references within square brackets must be placed before punctuation in the order of its first appearance. References list also should be numbered in square brackets as in main text citations. The references should be in Vancouver style. For full details on this refer to the following link to university of Queensland (http://www.library.uq.edu.au/training/citation/vancouver.pdf) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding citations, should we use an accent (') for the hispanic last name of the authors? Although reference #10 is from 2014 → Montalvo LM. Nivel de conocimiento en la prevención del pie diabético en personas con diabetes mellitus tipo 2 de un hospital de Lima - Perú 2014. [Tesis licenciatura]. Lima Perú. Facultad de Medicina. 2014. Spanish. Accessed 14 November 2016. Available: http://cybertesis.unmsm.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/cybertesis/4165/Castro_ah.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. We decided to keep it in the manuscript because it was the questionnaire we used as base to make the proper investigation.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There are a few mistakes in spacing of words.</p> <p>Authors to recheck for spelling and grammar mistakes</p>	We have corrected the errors
Optional/General comments	<p>Well done study.</p> <p>Corrections and suggestions mentioned above have to be carried out by the authors</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There were no ethical issues in this study.