



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_49910
Title of the Manuscript:	ATTITUDINAL DISPOSITION AND MANAGEMENT PERCEPTION AMONG DIABETES MELLITUS PATIENTS IN SELECTED HOSPITALS IN IBADAN, OYO STATE, NIGERIA
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>ATTITUDINAL DISPOSITION AND MANAGEMENT PERCEPTION AMONG DIABETES MELLITUS PATIENTS IN SELECTED HOSPITALS IN IBADAN, OYO STATE, NIGERIA</p> <p>It was a pleasure for me to review this paper. I read through this manuscript and I think that could be acceptable if some aspects are clarified. The subject is interesting and important. I congratulate the author.</p> <p>Bur, it is true that the study has two important problems: 1) poor methodological rigor, and 2) partly as a consequence of the first point, its lack of relevance and interest to the field of Health Science & Education.</p> <p>I suggest that, please, the authors check the following comments:</p> <p>-Sample and sample size: Please provide a flowchart. It seems that the sample size is calculated for the prevalence, but, was the sample size calculated for the comparison of the results between the groups (Sample Size for Comparing Two percentages/means)? Was the sample size calculated for the comparison of 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>-Questionnaire: It seems that the authors use a Likert scale in their questionnaire. When a questionnaire is used, with a Likert scale, it is always a problem with the validity. What was the reliability and validity of this questionnaire?</p> <p>The reliability of a measuring instrument refers to the consistency of the scores obtained by the same individuals when examined with the same instrument at different times, with different sets of equivalent elements or other variables under examination conditions. In calculating the reliability various methods can be used: a. Coefficient of internal consistency. This coefficient was proposed by Cronbach and called alpha indicates the extent to which all elements of the scale are consistent with each other. b. test-retest method. The measure of the reliability of the test is obtained by the Pearson correlation coefficient. c. Method of parallel forms. It can be made through the Pearson correlation coefficient. d. Method of the two halves. It can be made through the Pearson correlation coefficient and Spearman-Brown correction.</p> <p>The questionnaire should also be validated ("validity"). It is the degree to which a given instrument measures what it is to be measured. Its estimation is performed through different facets or types of validity: content, judgment, concurrent or convergent, construct or logic, predictive construction, and apparent. The best way to determine the validity is to test the instrument with a "gold standard". It can use other indirect methods to every facet of validity.</p> <p>Each researcher, depending on the specific characteristics of the questionnaire, must decide which method is applicable for the study of the reliability and validity where applicable. But should explain clearly why this was done or not done such a thing.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<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 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: Quality of life research: NLM Title Abbreviation: Qual Life Res</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