

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84433
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICES (KAP) ON DIABETIC FOOT CARE AMONG PATIENTS WITH DIABETES IN DISTRICT BAHAWALPUR, PAKISTAN
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- In the abstract section of the article, the method of work is explained very briefly.- How to select samples and sampling and data collection method is not well explained- Match keywords with mesh in Pabmad- Introduction Your study is very briefly written- Many required content has been removed- Mention new statistics and figures in this field by mentioning valid and up-to-date references- Multiple evidence need multiple references ?!- The importance of the topic and the study is not written in this article.- In Pakistan, what are the statistics of this population regarding diabetes and diabetic foot?- Did you not explain at all about this cap model that you used?- Why this model?- Where is its application in this study?- What is the data collection tool in this study?- Standard or researcher made?- Write the code of ethics with the design number.- How many questions was the questionnaire?- When did you collect this information?- Explain the validity and validity of the instrument and validation- In this section, you should write the type of statistical analysis you used, you did not mention it at all.- Fill in the separate title What is the example and where- In Table 1, why did not you check the mean for the variables and write with the standard deviation?- In Table 2, it is better to write the questions as complete phrases or a complete question ?!- In Tables 2 and 3, you can take the average for knowledge, attitude, etc., and then compare with each other. Why only numbers and percentages are taken?- In Tables 2 and 3, you can also write the total score of the variables.- It is better to explain the number of questions for each variable and the way of scoring and where the root of the tool comes from in the working method section.- First, you can merge all 3 variable tables- Also, modify the expressions in all 3 tables according to the comments in Table 2.- It is better to write the discussion in the order of the results obtained- In the discussion section, you should write the discussion according to the results obtained for each of the 3 separate variables- First, write the results of your study for knowledge, then compare several references with other studies, and then give the reason for your justification.- And ...- Write down the strengths and weaknesses of your study and your suggestions for other studies	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatemeh Darabi
Department, University & Country	Asadabad School of Meical Sciences, Iran