

Review of: "Glycemic Control and Its Determinants Among Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients at the Limbe Regional Hospital, Limbe, Southwestern Cameroon"

Jean Pierre Fina Lubaki

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall

A well written manuscript dealing with an important health outcome of a relevant public health issue.

To the attention of the authors

Use of abbreviation:

For the first time, please spell the name completely and put the abbreviations in brackets: What is 250 BC?

Use of terms

I would suggest to avoid to use the followings terms: diabetic patients. Rather use patients with diabetes or patients with type 2 diabetes. I would suggest that the authors follow this link to review the terms related to diabetes: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5241771/>

Background

Classification of diabetes: could the authors use the latest classification of WHO? <https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/325182/9789241515702-eng.pdf>

Glucose variability: I think the authors unnecessarily elaborate in broad on glucose variability. They could reduce to about three lines.

Could they present the paragraph on prevalence of diabetes before the one on glycaemic control?

There is need to update references on glycaemic control in Africa. I would suggest the following: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-022-00902-0>

Methods

Sample size and selection of the participants

Could the authors explain how they determined the sample and how the selection of the participants was done? This information is crucial.

Inclusion criteria: No information is provided for the age

Definition of poor glycaemic control

It is not clear why the authors cited a reference that used the 2020 ADA Standards for diabetes care while A UPDATED VERSION of this exists.

Also in the 2020 ADA Standards of diabetes Care, I could not find the distribution of glycaemic control into good, inadequate and poor. Could they cited the reference where they took this?.

Blood collection and analysis

Could the authors indicate how many milliliters of blood was drawn from the participants?

Discuss about possible bias in the study and how you managed to reduce their influence.

Results

Report on the response rate

Discussion

There is a need to strength the discussion by providing other arguments in the links between the factors identified and the glycaemic control.

Older age: the presence of comorbidities is another reason for poor glycaemic control. Could the authors explore this?

Please follow this link: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-022-00902-0>

Lack of self-home glucose monitoring: the lack of resources is also a reason why a great majority of persons with diabetes are not using the device. There is an issue to add in the discussion on factors influencing the practice of self-home glucose monitoring.

Diet/eating plan: the authors only emphasize for a diet rich in fiber. Could you elaborate more on the other food or nutrients?

Limitations of the study

The sample size is very small: what are the implications of that?

RECOMMENDATION

THE MANUSCRIPT NEEDS MAJOR REVISION