Review of: "Investigating the Levels of Obsession, Fear, and Self-Care Behaviors Related to COVID-19 in Fully Vaccinated and Partially Vaccinated Diabetic Patients"

Eda Ayten Kankaya[1]

1 Dokuz Eylül University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors, thank you for your efforts; however, the article needs major revision.

Title, purpose, and tables do not match. Is your aim to investigate the difference between the levels of obsession, fear, and self-care behaviours in vaccinated and unvaccinated DM patients? Please correct the title and purpose accordingly. In your tables and discussion, you have emphasised the difference between vaccinated and unvaccinated patients.

In the method section of the abstract, the date of data collection should be added, and the sampling method should be removed.

In the introduction of the study, how were the results related to fears, obsessions, and self-care behaviours in the international literature with diabetic patients? The gap in the literature should be emphasised.

In the method section, the type of research should be clearly written. Is it cross-sectional, prospective, or interventional? Inclusion criteria, dependent and independent variables, and research questions should be clearly be written.

The analysis section and the Self-Care Questionnaire Related to Corona section seem to be confused. A heading should be opened as "Analysis of the Data," and it should be stated with which parameters the normal distribution of the data was decided, which statistical analyses were used, and how many significance levels were taken.

The first sentence in the Results section should be removed, and data analysis should be added.
Did this patient group have comorbidities other than diabetes? This is an important variable. Patients with coronary artery disease or a previous MI are reported to have a higher fear of COVID. And did these patients have MIs during this period? Explain how you controlled the confounding factors.

In the findings, the number n should be added next to the percentages in brackets. For example, how many people were (57%)?

Tables have not been reviewed; the number n must be added to each cell. This spelling is incorrect.
Tables 2 and 3 should be combined. This will make it easier to read.

The p-value in the tables should be corrected to p<0.001 instead of 0.000.

The discussion should be revised according to your own findings.

Intext language editing should be done. For example, there are spelling mistakes in Acknowledgments.

The results and their use in practice should be revised.