



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_19028
Title of the Manuscript:	Diabetes Mellitus and Cerebrovascular accident among North African population (Libya) Community based survey
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	No compulsory revision is needed. The subject matter is original and important and will enlarge the existing knowledge in the field of clinical diagnosis and prevention of stroke. The study included a very big cohort of study subjects, which very important for statistical significance.	Many thanks All correction done as advised.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The article is written in very good English. The scientific quality of the article itself and the results presented is on a very high level.	Many thanks All correction done as advised.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are just some very little comments regarding not to the scientific part of the article but to the author's guidelines: 1. I am not sure if there is a need to write the the lists of tables and figures. 2. The abbreviations should come after keywords. 3. The abstract should not exceed 300 words in length, but it seems to be more than 400 words. 4. About 4-8 keywords should be given, but there are 11	1. It had been provided but it looks like usually they did not included it in the original article 2. Correction done as advised. 3. Correction done as advised (288 words)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	keywords. And also, the keywords must be informative, so I would suggest excluding the keywords prevalence, risk points, classification, community, Afrika, Libya. 5. The full form of each abbreviation should be given at first use in the text. And after giving an abbreviation for the first time the full text should not be written after. 6. Information presented in the figure should not be repeated in the table. The information in the table3 and figure 1, as well as table 4 and figure 2 seem to be repeated. 7. In table 3, I would suggest to indicate the first row as “Age” to make the table more understandable. 8. In tables and figures there is no need to give bullets, after the table numbering there has to be dot instead of colon, and after that the first letter should be a capital letter (lines 127, 134, 157, 161, 183, 193, 197). 9. There are very few trivial English errors, like “patients” instead of “patient” (lines 93, 96), “role” instead of “roll” (lines 101, 229), “in” instead of “on” (line 226), “and” instead of “&” (lines 154, 183), dots after references and in the middle of the sentence or their absence (lines 116, 118 (Table 1), 154, 230, 240), opened but not closed brackets (lines 115, 117-118).	4. Correction done as advised (4 keywords) 5. Correction done as advised. 6. I do agree, but I feel that this will help some readers to understand the results better specially if did not have time to read the tables they found the figure is useful. 7. Correction done as advised. 8. Correction done as advised. 9. All correction done as advised.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. The subheadings should be 11 font, and the sub-subheadings should be 10 font. 11. The references are not written according to the author's guideline.	10. Correction done as advised. 11. Correction done as advised.
--	---	---