

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_115632
Title of the Manuscript:	Glycemic Control and Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose in Type 2 Diabetic Patients on Insulin and Prevalence of Candidiasis in these Patients at Dschang District Hospital, Cameroon: A cross-sectional study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1.The problem of candida associated with diabetes is not a new thing, but if this topic is still desired, it must be presented with clinical implications. Otherwise, the article is just a collection of data. 2.Yes, but need more details about candida inside the article. 3. Yes 4. All chapters need improvement. They are specified in detail below Considering the topic addressed, it would be necessary in the introductory part to expose the problems given by candida albicans. It is necessary to understand from the beginning the connection between diabetes and candida. Otherwise, well-known thing. Result chapter Table 2 distribution by diabetes-specific characteristics, does not present a statistical interpretation, a statistical test to show us whether or not these values are important. Table 4 explains some of the mentioned problems, so I don't see the value of table 2. The same problems between table 3 and table 5. Part of the discussion does not explain the problems caused by candida The conclusions require rewriting, they are from the current study, not from the specialized literature. This chapter is the conclusion and clinical implications of this study, it does not contain bibliographic references. 5. Yes, but the data are not sufficiently explained and interpreted 6. Yes	All the suggestions are taken into account in the revised version of the manuscript. Thank you for the remarks and suggestions
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I cannot judge the correctness of the English language. In general, the article contains a collection of data, incoherent among them. The candida problem, which also appears in the title, is not described as having implications and why it was studied.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	