

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79476
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness of parents regarding DKA symptoms in their children with type I DM
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>)

[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	<p>The topic is interesting. The methodology should be improved, the test should be better explained, the dates of the study should be defined (discordant data on completion are given: November ? may?), The area where the test should be clarified is done (Asia, Asea, Aseer? Northern or West?), English should be greatly improved ("questions about the awareness about awareness of parents" page 4). The background Can't start with acronyms the reader may not know they are (DKA) When we say "About 65,000 children under the age of 15 develop T1DM each year" all over the world?.</p> <p>In my opinion, you have to revise the text, it gives the feeling that I am reading the 1st version, you have to be more careful in many aspects.</p> <p>I don't know if the search for parents should be done through social media, it could be a bias of people who are more used to looking for information. What was the response rate? Do you have a database of patients with DM1 or was it generally sent to the entire population? The methodology should be much more refined: the reader should be able to reproduce the study.</p> <p>The abstract is too short: it is difficult to get an idea of how the study was done.</p>	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	