Journal of Medical Education for Future Demands
Volume 21 · Issue 1 · e130597

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Design and Psychometrics of Diabetes Knowledge Questionnaire

Akram Mehrabbeik, Reyhaneh Azizi, Masoud Rahmanian, Nasim Namiranian, Marzieh Shukohifar, Mohammadjavad Asi

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 Aug 2022 | 24 Sep 2022 | 2 Nov 2022 | 10.5812/jme-130597 |

## About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

## Contents

1 **Original submission** Masomeh Kalantarion ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Masomeh Kalantarion ..... 3
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 4
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 5

## 1 Original submission

1 comment · 7 Sep 2022

**Masomeh Kalantarion** Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 7 Sep 2022

Abstract:
In the abstract section:
1. Suggestions for further studies should be added in the conclusion section.
In the introduction section:
2. Various standard questionnaires have been mentioned for measuring the knowledge of diabetic patients. The researchers have not explained why they did not use translated versions of these questionnaires or why they redesigned a questionnaire.
In the method section:
3. The sampling method and the method used to select patients are not mentioned.
4. What texts were used to design the questions? What reference was chosen to design the questions? How many experts selected the questions, and what were their specialties?
In the Discussion part:
5. The discussion should be challenging; it is not enough to mention similar or opposite studies. The interpretation of the article's authors should be based on comparing the results of the present study with the results of the proposed studies.
At least two of the articles of this journal should be referred to in the references section.

2

# Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Reviewer

While thanking you for your attention, the comments were answered and highlighted in the text of the article

Abstract:

In the abstract section:

1. Suggestions for further studies should be added in the conclusion section.

In the introduction section. (done in page 1)

2. Various standard questionnaires have been mentioned to measure the knowledge of diabetic patients. The reason for not using the translated format of these questionnaires has not been mentioned and why the researchers have re-designed a questionnaire. (added in page 3)

In the method section:

3. Sampling method and how to select patients are not mentioned. ( added in page 4)

4. What texts were used to design the questions? What reference was chosen to design the questions? How many experts and with what specialty did they select the questions? ( added in page 4)

In the Discussion part:

5. The discussion should be challenging; it is not enough to mention similar or opposite studies. The interpretation of the article's authors should be based on comparing the results of the present study with the results of the proposed studies. ( added in page 9-10) In general, because the current questionnaire has not been used elsewhere and was not a translated version, there was no accurate tool to compare the results and therefore the discussion was less challenging.

At least two of the articles of this journal should be referred to in the references section. (references 2 and 10 were added).

## 2 Revision 1

1 comment · 24 Oct 2022

**Masomeh Kalantarion** Reviewer

ACCEPT 24 Oct 2022

The authors revised their manuscript based on my comments.