



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_48059
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenylthiocarbamide Taste Perception among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus
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:

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

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>Phenylthiocarbamide Taste Perception among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus</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>-Abbreviations: The first time an abbreviation appears in the text its meaning must be fully written (Abstract is not good place to include abbreviations, because they confuse the reader).</p> <p>-Sample and sample size Please provide a flowchart. 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. Was the sample size calculated for the comparison the results between the groups? What were the hypothetical mean values or differences between groups, power, etc., to calculate the sample size? The authors could provide all the statistical parameters of their samples.</p> <p>-Discussion: 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 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>-Conclusion: It is important in any scientific paper to point out the problems that, from the current study,</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	are still pending solution or clarification. -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)	
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