Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJTDH_84952**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Prevalence and factors associated with diabetes in Côte d'Ivoire: a cross-sectional study in the country's adult population.**
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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The above mentioned manuscript is a cross-sectional study and described the Prevalence and factors associated with diabetes in adult population of Côte d'Ivoire. However, some unintended minor mistakes observed throughout the manuscript especially in the tables which need to be corrected before publication. And also factors associated with the prevalence of diabetes (table 3) should be explained in proper statistical scale (mentioning adjusted odds ratio) both in the result-section and in discussion (also in the abstract) as logistic regression (which was pretty good) was performed to find the predictors of the diabetes.	
Minor REVISION comments	**Minor corrections** • Page 3, line 3: authors should 1st elaborate the actual term then should be abbreviated, KISCH table ----reference (ref 13) cite in France lagunage (!) 2.4. Data processing and analysis • 2nd para 2nd line: Authors mentioned 'The univariate analysis------simple logistic regression"------actually it should be bivariate analysis (as one dependable variable and one independent variable worked together) • Authors mentioned that they enumerated 'Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of fit' and ROC curve for assessing validity of the result ----------but did not out line in the manuscript—should mention 'Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness' value with P-value as a table foot note and can show ROC curve. **Results** 1. (Especially table 3) factors associated with the prevalence of diabetes should be explained in proper statistical scale especially those factors showed higher odds ratios like older age (Adjusted odds ratio/AOR 1.61), borderline physical activity (AOR 1.62), Having Family heredity (AOR 2.5), high TG (AOR 3.3), LDL (AOR 2.1). 2. Should explain like this way ---e.g. Having higher TG level (≥2 unit) among diabetic are 3-times (AOR 3.30) more likely to be associated with prevalence of diabetes as compared to having <1.5 unit TG level (P<0.001). 3. Though authors claimed there was no significant (P<0.05) difference between male and female sex having diabetes (also mentioned in discussion) but in table-3 4th column it showed significant (AOR 1.56, p=0.020*????)---authors should recheck the analyses result and correct. Tables • Authors used comma (,) instead of dot/point (.) (Exception found in result section) before fractional number in all tables (e.g. page 5, table-1, % of male written as **43,34** instead of **43.34**%) • Same corrections are needed for almost all other numbers (as expressing % of the variables) in the same table (table-1) and also for other tables (table2 and 3). Table-3 • Authors should mention 'risk factors' on the 1st column of the heading of table-1 (this space is empty!) • Authors should put both number (n) and percentage (%) in the second column named Diabetes, it is not clear—whether it is % or number as authors used comma instead of point. • It's not clear what does it mean by P>|z| (P-value???)-On the 3rd and 5th column of heading of the table 3, page 9---authors should mention it under the table's footnote. • Authors should clearly write about 'professional activity', does it means having job?—should mention clearly. • It's look like authors mentioning 2 numbers (1,29) (table 3, page 9, adjusted odds	

	ratio) by separating a comma which actually was odds ratio • Authors should mention the reference category under the table's footnote (table 3, page 9)—which was denoted as 1 on the adjusted odds ratio column • Table-3 (title: **Risk factors most significantly associated with diabetes among respondents on** page 9) is huge (it takes 3 pages)- so authors should describe it as "continued" while giving running title on the next page. • Authors missed to put information on 'level of education" in the columns of adjusted odds ratio and 95% CI (table 3, page 9) • Author should clear about '**Nibbling' of what (if it is alcohol, should use sip) (page10)** • Authors should write BMI (kg/m2) along with Nutritional status (1st column, page 10) as this describing BMI. • Authors should mention the unit of waist size, LDL, HDL, and total cholesterol, TG etc. • There noticed a problem in waist size (or circumference???) as 4 categories showed 3 results/outcomes and also male repetition (??)----authors should correct and mention in the table's footnote. • Authors should correctly write the direction of square bracket ([ ]) for 2nd categories of triglyceride and LDL. • It's not clear what does it mean by Yes (M<0,4 et F<0,5 in HDL cholesterol category---should mention in the table footnote. • Authors used asterisk (*) as superscript of the p-value but didn't mention its value under the table foot note. **Discussion** • **Should follow above instruction 2 in the result section.** • **Authors should mention date along with authors name throughout the discussion (e.g. 5th para of the discussion** Amoussou-Guenou et. al. (2015) in Benin and Tripathy et al. (2017)**]** **References** It not clear why authors select mostly (almost half! 14 out of 29 references) French language journal (reference number 1-3, 5-13, 16, 20), while lots of reference journal of diabetes in English are already available-----could not possible to check the French journals!! However, English version of these possibly could solve the problem of the readers!	
Optional/General 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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mahbuba Kawser**
Department, University & Country	**Institute of Nutrition and Food Science (INFS), University of Dhaka, Bangladesh**