



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 (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		
<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 some of this to the Introduction section.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors may consider the above comments	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia