



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_16069
Title of the Manuscript:	A cross-sectional study of adherence to lifestyle modifications among ambulatory type 2 diabetic Nigerians in a resource-poor setting of a primary care clinic in Eastern 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This is a cross-sectional study aimed to determine adherence to LSMs among ambulatory type 2 diabetic Nigerians. Generally, the paper was written clearly and interestingly, with only minor typo and grammatical errors as well as a few comments as the following: 1. Title: sufficient to reflect the main idea of the paper. 2. Abstract: Enough to summarize the study, however, a bit lengthy especially the methodology. 3. Introduction: a. Enough to give an overview of the rationale of the study. b. Line 44-45: requires reference/citation. c. Line 64-66: Wordy and a bit confusing, may need to rephrase the sentence. 4. Materials and Methods: a. To combine heading and contents for Study design and setting. Author can also combine the ethical consideration under this heading. b. Line 142, Methods: Do you mean the procedure, if yes, please change the heading. 5. Line 195; Operational definitions: This part is quite distracting. Is this necessary, or may move	1. Thanks 2. Thanks 3. a. Thanks b. Reference citation inserted c. Sentence shortened and rephrased 4. a. Study design and setting combined. Combining ethical consideration and patient consent is inappropriate. b. Methods changed to study procedure as suggested by the reviewer. 5. The operational definition is appropriate in the methodology section. It is technically different



SDI Review Form 1.6

	some of this to the Introduction section. 6. Discussion: This is the best part of this write-up. The authors discussed each finding clearly and in-depth with good supports from previous evidence. 7. Limitations and Conclusion: The authors have addressed this reasonably.	from conceptual definition which should be in the introduction section. 6. Thanks 7. Thanks
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors may consider the above comments	Comments largely considered