

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78961
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding Patients Experiences Living with Diabetes Mellitus: A Qualitative Study, Gujarat, India.
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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 (X)	<p>I have indicated the necessary corrections on the text of the article.</p> <p>I have indicated the necessary corrections on the text of the article. Why were patients between the ages of 30 and 70 included in the study? This situation needs to be explained.</p> <p>References should be arranged according to the writing rules of the journal.</p>	<p>Thank you for your valuable comments, and properly checked my article and i have made all the correction which were highlighted by peer reviewer.</p> <p>Current study is a qualitative study, aimed to assess lived in experiences of diabetes patients in terms of all the five domains, how all domains affected by diabetes, where researcher required in-depth interview and establish good commutation with the samples, that why we limited age group to avoid any kind of problems during data collection from the samples. Because those who are living with Diabetes mellitus from many years they may have severe complications and they might be able to participate in the study, they might be able to established good commutation with researcher which is foremost required this study.</p> <p>References has been garaged properly in Vancouver style</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>