

# Review of: "Evaluation of Diabetes Risk Score Tool for Detecting Undiagnosed Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Attendees of Referral Clinics at Primary Health Care Centers, Sudan"

Saima Askari<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Baqai Institute of Diabetology & Endocrinology

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Nicely conducted study; however, a few suggestions are as follows.

1. If a pilot study was conducted before the main study, it is crucial to elucidate how the questions were added or modified based on the insights gained from the pilot phase. Discussing the adjustments made to the questionnaire, survey instruments, or interview guides as a result of the pilot study is essential in the methodology or methods section. Detailing the feedback received from participants during the pilot and how it influenced the refinement of survey questions can enhance the transparency of the research process. This information not only validates the appropriateness of the study instruments but also demonstrates a systematic approach to questionnaire development, improving the overall robustness of the research methodology.
2. The methodology section of the manuscript requires improvement, particularly in outlining clear inclusion and exclusion criteria and providing operational definitions. The absence of well-defined criteria for participant selection introduces ambiguity, compromising the study's validity. Additionally, the lack of explicit operational definitions hinders the understanding of key variables and measurement procedures. It is crucial to revise the methodology section to include transparent inclusion/exclusion criteria and detailed operational definitions, enhancing the study's rigor and facilitating its reproducibility and evaluation.
3. The discrepancy between the higher number of female participants in the results and contradictory statements in the discussion section needs clarification. It is essential to address this inconsistency and provide an explanation for the observed gender disparity. This could involve re-evaluating the data, considering potential biases, or discussing any unexpected findings. A coherent and transparent explanation in the discussion section will enhance the credibility and interpretation of the study results.
4. The discussion section should include a thorough examination of both similar and dissimilar findings in relation to existing literature. Comparisons between the current study's results and prior research are essential for contextualizing and interpreting the outcomes. Highlighting similarities can underscore the reliability and generalizability of the findings, while addressing differences may lead to insights into potential contributing factors or methodological distinctions. By thoroughly exploring both convergent and divergent aspects, the discussion will provide a nuanced and comprehensive

understanding of the study's contributions in the broader research landscape.

5, The absence of a clear conclusion following the discussion section is noteworthy. A well-structured conclusion is crucial to summarize the key findings, restate the study's significance, and propose any implications or recommendations. By incorporating a robust conclusion, the research will attain a more comprehensive and conclusive narrative, enhancing its overall impact and providing a succinct summary for readers. Consider revising the manuscript to include a dedicated conclusion section that effectively encapsulates the study's main outcomes and their broader implications.