EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
16 YEARS

Paper: **"Asociación de redes de apoyo y adherencia al tratamiento en pacientes con diabetes tipo 2"**

Submitted: 20 October 2025
Accepted: 30 December 2025
Published: 31 January 202

Corresponding Author: Cynthia Edith Quiroz

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n3p13

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jay Molino
Universidad Especializada de las Américas (UDELAS), Panama

Reviewer 2: Rafael Antonio Estévez Ramos
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México

Reviewer 3: Manuel Gonzalez Perez
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, Mexico

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
El título es claro, preciso y refleja adecuadamente las variables estudiadas (redes de apoyo y adherencia al tratamiento). Resume bien el propósito del estudio. No requiere cambios mayores.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
El resumen es comprensible y contiene los elementos esenciales del estudio. Podría mejorarse incorporando métricas adicionales (por ejemplo, valores de asociación o intervalos de confianza) y reduciendo algunas frases largas. En general es adecuado.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Sí, se observan errores menores de puntuación, concordancia y estilo, así como algunas frases extensas que dificultan la fluidez. Sugiero una revisión lingüística detallada antes de su aceptación final.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
La metodología es sólida y está descrita con suficiente detalle. Los criterios de inclusión/exclusión, el uso del Morisky Green-8 y del inventario de apoyo social, el tamaño muestral y el análisis estadístico están claramente expuestos. Sin embargo, sería útil incorporar información sobre la validez o confiabilidad de los instrumentos utilizados, o incluir las referencias en las que fueron validados.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
La estructura es coherente y las tablas están bien presentadas. No obstante, en los Resultados se repite información que ya aparece en las tablas, lo que podría resumirse para mejorar la concisión. El contenido general es claro y consistente.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Las conclusiones son coherentes con los hallazgos y destacan adecuadamente el papel de las redes de apoyo en la adherencia al tratamiento. Sería recomendable incluir una breve discusión de las limitaciones del estudio (p. ej., diseño transversal, muestreo no probabilístico) y posibles líneas de investigación futura.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
La mayoría de las referencias son reales y accesibles; se validaron varias al azar y corresponden a fuentes auténticas. No obstante, existe una dependencia muy marcada de tesis de licenciatura y maestría (literatura gris), lo cual limita el peso académico del marco teórico. Sería beneficioso equilibrar la lista con mayor proporción de artículos revisados por pares, guías clínicas internacionales (ADA, OMS, IDF) y estudios comparativos de mayor alcance. Además, se sugiere revisar el formato y la consistencia de algunos registros bibliográficos.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
El estudio aborda un tema relevante y aporta evidencia útil sobre el rol de las redes de apoyo en la adherencia terapéutica. La metodología es clara y los resultados están bien presentados. Se recomienda revisar la interpretación epidemiológica sobre la distribución por sexo, mejorar la sección ética proporcionando los datos necesarios del comité, reforzar la calidad de las referencias incorporando mayor literatura indexada, y realizar una revisión lingüística final. Con estos ajustes, el artículo alcanzará un nivel apropiado para su publicación.

Corrección factual importante:
En la Discusión, el manuscrito sugiere que “a nivel mundial predomina el sexo femenino” en diabetes tipo 2.
Esto no es correcto según la evidencia epidemiológica disponible; la prevalencia global es ligeramente mayor en hombres.
El predominio de mujeres en estudios locales suele deberse a mayor asistencia a servicios de salud y a factores socioculturales, no a prevalencia global. Recomiendo ajustar esta interpretación.

Aspectos éticos:
El manuscrito afirma que contó con autorización de un comité local, pero no menciona:
1. nombre del comité de ética,
2. institución a la que pertenece,

3. número o código de aprobación.
Para cumplir con estándares internacionales de transparencia, estos datos deben incluirse. Si el estudio fue exento o evaluado como riesgo mínimo, debe explicarse explícitamente.

Literatura y referencias:
Aunque las referencias son genuinas, muchas corresponden a tesis o repositorios institucionales. Sería recomendable reforzar la fundamentación con artículos revisados por pares y guías reconocidas internacionalmente.

Redacción:
Hay tramos de la Discusión y de los Resultados que pueden sintetizarse. También se recomienda una revisión de estilo para mejorar claridad y eliminar repeticiones.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Si, expresa lo necesario
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Si, muy completo
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Si, en Métodos dice: Se realizo debe de decir: Se realizó, lleva acentuación
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Si
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Es claro y no se observan errores
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
La palabra conclusión está mal escrita
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Correctas
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Corregir las dos palabras mal escritas señaladas

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*

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.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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. Manuel González P´erez	
University/Country: UNIVERSIDAD TECNOLÓGICA DE TECAMACHALCO/MEXICO	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 NOV 2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Association of support networks and treatment adherence in patients with type 2 diabetes.**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1112/25	
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	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The title "Association of support networks and treatment adherence in patients with type 2 diabetes" is both clear and appropriate. It directly signals the two central variables of the study (support networks and adherence) and the population of interest (patients with type 2 diabetes). *To strengthen your article presentation, here are a few considerations you might find useful:* *Why the title works well* • *Clarity: Readers immediately know the focus is on social support and adherence.* • *Specificity: It specifies the patient group (type 2 diabetes), avoiding ambiguity.* • *Academic tone: Neutral, precise, and aligned with research conventions.* *Possible refinement (if you want to emphasize scope or methodology)* • *Add contextual detail: e.g., "...in a community-based cohort" or "...in Mexican patients" if your study is localized.* • *Highlight study design: e.g., "...a cross-sectional analysis" or "...a longitudinal study".* • *Emphasize outcomes: e.g., "...and its impact on glycemic control".* *Examples of alternative titles:* • *"Impact of Support Networks on Treatment Adherence Among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes"* • *"Social Support and Medication Adherence in Type 2 Diabetes: A Cross-Sectional Study"* • *"Role of Support Systems in Enhancing Treatment Compliance in Type 2 Diabetes Patients"* *These variations keep the clarity but adjust emphasis depending on whether you want to highlight impact, design, or role.*	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4**
Suggestions to polish the abstract • *Objective clarity: Explicitly state the aim in one sentence, e.g., "This study aimed to analyze the association between support networks and treatment adherence in patients with type 2 diabetes."* • *Results precision: Instead of "p value = 000," write "p < 0.001" for clarity.* • *Flow: Shorten long sentences for readability. For example:* *"Patients with support networks showed better glycemic control (59% fasting glucose, 68% HbA1c controlled), while those without support networks had higher uncontrolled rates (63% and 53%, respectively)."*	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
Great job! Your text scores 100 out of 100. This score represents the quality of writing in this document.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**

Suggested refinements

- *Avoid repetition: The "Métodos" section is duplicated in your text. Keep only one version.*
- *Precision in language: Instead of "población estudiada fueron los pacientes con diagnóstico…", use "La población estuvo conformada por pacientes con diagnóstico…".*
- *Sample size explanation: Briefly mention the parameters used in the formula (expected proportions, effect size).*
- *Ethics statement: Add that the study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki or national regulations, if required.*
- *Statistical detail: Clarify whether chi-square was used for categorical variables only, and whether any other tests were applied for continuous variables (e.g., t-test).*

In summary: Yes, your methods are clear and complete. With minor adjustments (removing repetition, tightening phrasing, and adding small statistical/ethical details), they will be perfectly aligned with journal standards.

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**

Strengths

- *Organization: You separate sociodemographic and clinical variables, then move to the association analysis.*
- *Comparisons: Both groups are consistently compared (with vs. without support networks).*
- *Statistical reporting: You indicate which findings are significant and which are not.*
- *Operational definitions: You clearly explain how support networks and adherence were classified (cut-off points in questionnaires).*
- *Main finding: The association between support networks and adherence is highlighted with percentages and statistical significance.*

Issues to refine

1. Statistical notation:

- *You write "p=000". The correct format is "$p < 0.001$".*
- *This avoids confusion and aligns with international standards.*

2. Clarity in phrasing:

- *Instead of "predominó la descontrolada", use "predominó el estado no controlado".*
- *Replace "se presentó con 57% el empleado(a)" with "predominó la ocupación de empleado(a) con 57%".*
- *These small changes improve readability.*

3. Consistency in percentages:

- *Always specify whether percentages refer to within-group proportions. For example: "En el grupo con redes de apoyo, 58% fueron mujeres" instead of "predominó el sexo femenino (58%)".*

4. Tables and figures:

- *You reference "Cuadro VII.1" but don't show it here. Ensure the table is properly formatted with clear headings (variable, group 1, group 2, p-value).*

5. Precision in definitions:

- *For adherence, clarify: "Se consideró adherente al paciente con puntuación de 8 en el test de Morisky Green-8".*
- *For support networks: "≥100 puntos en el inventario de apoyo social".*

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**

Why they are accurate

- *Global and national context: You correctly state that type 2 diabetes is a chronic disease with high prevalence worldwide and a major health problem in Mexico. This aligns with the introduction and background.*
- *Link to study findings: You highlight the association between support networks and treatment adherence, which was demonstrated in your results (patients with support networks had higher adherence and better glycemic control).*
- *Clinical relevance: You emphasize that support networks are a pillar for adherence and can be strengthened through family, friends, and institutional programs — this is consistent with your data and discussion.*
- *Practical implications: You connect the findings to the role of family physicians, suggesting interventions to foster support networks and lifestyle changes. This is a logical extension of your results.*

Minor refinements for clarity

Avoid redundancy: Instead of "pueden desarrollarse muchas complicaciones asociadas a esto", you could write "pueden desarrollarse múltiples complicaciones".

- *Precision in phrasing: Replace "favorecer en gran manera el desarrollo de su enfermedad" with "favorecer el control de la enfermedad" — otherwise it sounds like support networks worsen the disease.*
- *Strengthen the conclusion statement: End with a concise, impactful sentence that directly reflects your main finding, e.g.:*

"En conclusión, la presencia de redes de apoyo se asocia significativamente con una mayor adherencia al tratamiento y mejor control glucémico en pacientes con diabetes tipo 2."

So yes, your conclusions are accurate and well supported, but with small wording adjustments they can be even more precise and impactful for publication.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**

Yes — your references are comprehensive and appropriate for the topic of support networks and treatment adherence in patients with type 2 diabetes. Let me highlight why they work well and where you could refine them for stronger academic presentation:

Strengths

- *Breadth of sources: You include theses, institutional repositories, peer-reviewed articles, and regional journals from Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay, and other Latin American contexts. This gives your work strong regional relevance.*
- *Direct relevance: Most references explicitly address social support, family support, adherence, and glycemic control — exactly aligned with your study variables.*
- *Recent publications: Several sources are from 2022–2024, ensuring up-to-date context.*
- *Variety of study designs: You cite cross-sectional studies, prevalence studies, and association analyses, which enrich the background.*
- *Ethical and clinical focus: Many references emphasize psychosocial factors, family functioning, and coping strategies, supporting your conclusions.*

Areas to refine

- *Consistency in formatting:*
- *Some entries lack proper punctuation or spacing (e.g., "Cruz, G. K.., Villa Mejía" has double periods).*
- *Ensure uniformity in italics for journal titles and correct capitalization.*
- *Missing details:*
- *Reference 11 (Gomez Portillo et al., 2024) does not include a URL or DOI. Add repository or access link for completeness.*
- *Reference 21 lacks year formatting consistency (should be 2021 instead of missing parentheses).*
- *Balance of sources:*
- *Most references are theses. While valid, adding more peer-reviewed journal articles (like refs 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 21) strengthens credibility for indexed publications.*

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) **:**

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

General Comments

- The manuscript addresses an important topic: the role of support networks in treatment adherence among patients with type 2 diabetes. This is highly relevant for both clinical practice and public health.

- The structure (Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusions, References) is clear and follows standard academic conventions.
- The study is well contextualized with regional data and supported by a comprehensive reference list.

Specific Suggestions
Title & Abstract
*- The title is clear and adequate, but consider emphasizing the *impact* or *association strength* to make it more engaging for readers.*
*- The abstract presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. To improve readability, shorten sentences and report p-values as *p < 0.001* instead of *p=000*.*

Methods
- The methodology is well explained, but avoid duplication of text.
- Clarify the parameters used in the sample size calculation (expected proportions, effect size).
- Specify whether chi-square was applied only to categorical variables, and whether continuous variables were analyzed with other tests.
- Strengthen the ethics statement by noting compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki or national regulations.

Results
- Results are clear and consistent with the objectives.
- Improve phrasing for precision (e.g., "estado no controlado" instead of "descontrolada").
- Ensure all tables referenced (e.g., Cuadro VII.1) are properly formatted and included.
- Report percentages consistently as within-group proportions.

Conclusions
- Conclusions are supported by the data.
- Refine wording to avoid ambiguity (e.g., replace "favorecer en gran manera el desarrollo de su enfermedad" with "favorecer el control de la enfermedad").
*- End with a strong, concise statement: *"Las redes de apoyo se asocian significativamente con la adherencia terapéutica y el control glucémico en pacientes con diabetes tipo 2."**

References
- References are comprehensive and relevant, but formatting should be standardized (APA 7th edition recommended).
- Add missing repository links or DOIs where possible.
- Balance the list by including more peer-reviewed journal articles alongside theses.

Overall Recommendation
*The manuscript is solid and addresses a critical issue in diabetes care. With minor refinements in **statistical reporting, phrasing, formatting, and reference consistency**, it will be ready.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- The manuscript addresses a relevant and timely issue in diabetes care: the association between support networks and treatment adherence. This is particularly important in the Latin American context, where family and community structures play a central role in chronic disease management.

- The study design is appropriate (cross-sectional, analytic), and the sample size is adequate. However, the reliance on non-probabilistic quota sampling may limit generalizability, which should be noted in the editorial decision.

*- The manuscript is well organized, but the Results section could benefit from clearer tables and standardized reporting of p-values (e.g., *p < 0.001*).*

- The reference list is comprehensive, though heavily weighted toward theses and institutional repositories. While these sources are valid, the editors may wish to encourage the authors to strengthen the manuscript with more peer-reviewed journal articles to enhance its scholarly impact.

- Ethical approval is documented, which supports the integrity of the study.

- Overall, the manuscript contributes to the literature on psychosocial determinants of treatment adherence in type 2 diabetes and may be of interest to readers in family medicine, public health, and chronic disease management. With minor revisions, it is suitable for consideration in an indexed journal.