

Paper: **“Knowledge & Awareness about COVID-19 and the Practice of Respiratory Hygiene and Other Preventive Measures among Patients with Diabetes Mellitus in Pakistan”**

Corresponding Author: Kiran Abbas

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n12p53

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Evelio Velis
Barry University, USA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.04.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Evelio Velis	
University/Country: Barry University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/01/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/03/2020
Manuscript Title: Knowledge & Awareness about COVID-19 and the Practice of Respiratory Hygiene and Other Preventive Measures in a Developing Country	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Knowledge & Awareness about COVID-19 and the Practice of Respiratory Hygiene and Other Preventive Measures in a Developing Country

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> They are assessing knowledge, may be the word assessment or evaluation should be included in the title.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Only very few errors were found and corrected using MS Word <i>Track Changes</i> option.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
This is a descriptive study. The authors should clearly report the study design, sample size calculation and selection (sampling techniques) and the <u>limitations</u> of the study. I am assuming that the authors used a <u>convenience</u> sample. Therefore, the study findings/results should <u>not</u> be generalized. If this is the case, they should be report it under Methods.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Restructure tables using the APA format recommendations. Review and follow the guidelines in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The authors should report the <u>limitations</u> of the study, especially regarding generalizability of the study findings.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I would recommend the authors to double check the “in-text citation” and correlate the citation with the References list based on APA style/format recommendation.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See comments under each section above.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

See comments under each section above.



ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Blinded	Email:
University/Country: Blinded	
Date Manuscript Received: 10 th April, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 th April, 2020
Manuscript Title: Knowledge & Awareness about COVID-19 and the Practice of Respiratory Hygiene and Other Preventive Measures in Developing Countries.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No: NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No: NO	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments).</i> The title is current and very adequate to the content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objectives, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments):</i> Specific objectives are not outlined	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments):</i> Such minimal mistakes have been corrected or suggestions given.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments):</i> The methodology is well done	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments):</i> The body is well organized from introduction to conclusion. The text was not justified but it was corrected.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments):</i> The conclusion is clearly related to the title of the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments):</i> The references are current but the authors will have to revise this section thoroughly to meet the journal requirements.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed: The comments are well outlined in the document. Additionally, the authors to consider wearing of masks as a precautionary measure.	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a very current study. Kindly consider the suggested corrections to make it a good piece of work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This study has proved that social media is key in research. The authors need to be given guidance on a particular referencing and citation style. The most commonly used is

APA. Finally, I am grateful for this opportunity to review the paper and your patience. I really appreciate.

