

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52184

Date: 11/06/2025

Title: Assessment Diabetes Screening Camp Among Adults in Village Bhaganki, Panchgaon, Gurugram

Recommendation:

Accept as it is
 Accept after minor revision.....Yes.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	•			
Techn. Quality		•		
Clarity	•			
Significance	•			

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sireesha Kuruganti

Date: 11/06/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

This manuscript describes a valuable and well-intentioned community health initiative. The study's aim to assess the prevalence of diabetes and hypertension in a specific population is clear, and the event serves as a good model for community health outreach.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

"Assessment Diabetes Screening Camp Among Adults in Village Bhaganki, Panchgaon, Gurugram."

Review of Manuscript: IJAR-52184

General Comments:

This manuscript describes a valuable and well-intentioned community health initiative. The study's aim to assess the prevalence of diabetes and hypertension in a specific population is clear, and the event serves as a good model for community health outreach. However, the manuscript requires significant revisions to meet the standards for scholarly publication. The primary concerns relate to the incomplete reference list, missing methodological details, an underdeveloped discussion section, and errors in data presentation (figures). Addressing these points will substantially strengthen the paper.

Specific Comments by Line Number

Title

* Line 1: The title is slightly awkward. Consider rephrasing for better flow.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Suggestion: "A Diabetes Screening Camp for Adults in Bhaganki Village, Gurugram: A Health Assessment Report" or "Prevalence of Prediabetes, Diabetes, and Hypertension at a Community Screening Camp in Rural Gurugram."

Abstract

* Lines 4-10: The abstract provides a reasonable summary of the work.

* Line 10: The phrase "hypertension-related concerns" is vague. It would be more precise to state the number of individuals identified with hypertension.

* Suggestion: Change to "and 10 were found to have hypertension."

Introduction

* Line 16: The introduction provides a good general overview of diabetes as a global health issue.

* Line 27: The statistic "About 830 million people worldwide have diabetes" is exceptionally high and likely inaccurate. The International Diabetes Federation (IDF) Diabetes Atlas (10th edition, 2021) estimated 537 million adults with diabetes. This figure should be checked and cited from a reliable source like the IDF or WHO.

* General Comment: The introduction effectively establishes the global problem but fails to provide a local context or rationale. Why was Bhaganki village chosen for this camp? Is there pre-existing data suggesting a high-risk population? Adding a sentence or two about the specific need in this community would strengthen the paper's foundation.

Methodology

* Line 40: Providing the exact date and time of the camp is good practice and adds to the study's replicability.

* Lines 47-48: The manuscript lists "Blood Pressure Monitoring for hypertension detection" but does not provide the classification criteria used (i.e., the blood pressure ranges for normal, Type I, and Type II hypertension). This is a critical omission, as it makes the results in section 3.4 impossible to interpret independently. Please add the classification system used (e.g., JNC 8, ACC/AHA 2017).

* Line 49: The manuscript specifies "Random Blood Sugar (RBS) Testing." It would be beneficial to mention the type of equipment used (e.g., a specific brand of glucometer) to add technical rigor.

Results and Findings

* Figure on Page 2 (BMI Calculations): There is a significant error in this figure.

* The text states there are four BMI categories: Underweight (4 individuals), Normal (61), Overweight (18), and Obesity (5).

* However, the pie chart legend only lists three categories. The "Underweight" category (4.5% of participants) is completely missing from the legend and appears to have been omitted from the chart itself. The chart and legend must be corrected to accurately represent all four data categories mentioned in the text.

* Lines 65-67: The results for the diabetes screening are clearly presented and the totals add up correctly ($63+18+7 = 88$ participants).

* Figure on Page 3 (Hypertension Screening): The legend entry "Diagnosed with Type II Hypertension." contains a typographical error (an extra period at the end). Please correct for consistency.

* Line 71-73: As mentioned in the methodology section, the results for hypertension are presented without the corresponding BP value ranges, making them difficult to interpret.

Discussion

* Lines 76-82: The discussion section is currently too brief and largely repeats the results. A robust discussion should:

* Compare Findings: How does the prevalence of prediabetes (20.5%) and diabetes (8%) in this sample compare to district, state, or national averages for India? Comparing the findings with existing literature is essential for putting the results into context.

* Discuss Implications: Elaborate on the implications of finding that nearly 28.5% of the adult participants have either prediabetes or diabetes. What does this mean for the local healthcare system?

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Acknowledge Limitations: The study has several limitations that must be acknowledged. These include:

- * A small, non-random sample of 88 individuals, which may not be representative of the entire village.

- * The use of Random Blood Sugar (RBS) testing, which is a screening tool and not as definitive for diagnosis as Fasting Blood Glucose or HbA1c.

- * The cross-sectional "snapshot" nature of a single-day camp.

- * Explore Connections: Discuss the strong correlation between the BMI findings (26% being overweight or obese) and the diabetes/hypertension results.

Conclusion & Recommendations

- * Lines 86-91: The conclusion is appropriate and summarizes the project's success in its immediate goals.

- * Lines 93-99: The recommendations are excellent, practical, and provide a clear path forward for sustainable health initiatives in the community.

References

- * Lines 101-105: This is the most critical error in the manuscript. The text contains citations for at least 46 sources, but the reference list only includes two. All sources cited in the text must appear in the reference list, and the list should be formatted consistently according to the journal's guidelines. This omission must be rectified before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

Final Recommendation

Decision: Major Revisions Required

The manuscript addresses a relevant community health issue and presents the results of a commendable initiative. However, it currently falls short of the scientific and formatting standards required for publication due to a critically incomplete reference list, missing methodological details (hypertension classification), flawed data visualization (BMI chart), and an underdeveloped discussion. The authors are encouraged to revise the manuscript thoroughly based on the comments provided above. With these changes, the paper has the potential to be a valuable contribution to the literature on community health screening.