



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_50714
Title of the Manuscript:	Diabetes Self-Management and its Related Factors among Type 2 Diabetes Patients in Primary Health Care Settings of Kerman, Southeast Iran
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=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>Diabetes Self-Management and its Related Factors among Type 2 Diabetes Patients in Primary Health Care Settings of Kerman, Southeast Iran</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>-Sample and sample size Please provide a flowchart.</p> <p>Apparently, the sample was selected, in the twelve urban health centers, via convenience sampling method. 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>-Questionnaire: What was the reliability and validity of this questionnaire? Was the questionnaire translated into another language? Was its reliability and validity re-evaluated? [Translation of a scale: In addition to using rigorous translation and evaluation methods to ensure cultural equivalence, the psychometric properties of the instrument should be ensured in each culture or country where it is to be used, including item-scale correlations (Cronbach's alpha), comparisons of responses, the correlation of the scale with an existing gold standard or other similar instruments and the analysis of the psychometric properties of the instrument in relation to the subgroups of the population of interest)]</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 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: The authors write: "A multidisciplinary approach including ongoing patients' educations about diabetes self-management, training to increase family and social support, identifying lifestyle modification in high-risk patients, and using motivational modality can improve compliance with DSM behaviors. " And also: "Diabetes self-management as one of the</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>important components of a diabetes control program should be considered in the first level of health care delivery system in Iran." However, it is not possible to conclude these facts of the study. These conclusions must be reformed or deleted.</p> <p>On the other hand, it is important in any scientific paper to point out the problems that, from the current essay or study, are still pending solution or clarification.</p> <p>-References: Review, please, the rules of the Journal. 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 For example: Diabetes research and clinical practice. NLM Title Abbreviation: Diabetes Res Clin Pract</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>	

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jose Luis Turabian
Department, University & Country	Spain