

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 89578

**Title:** Application of three-dimensional speckle tracking technique in measuring left ventricular myocardial function in patients with diabetes

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07917216

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Research Associate

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** New Zealand

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-12-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-12-07 02:00

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-12-12 08:45

**Review time:** 5 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic of this manuscript falls within the scope of World Journal of Diabetes. The Authors explored the assessment of 3D-STI in estimating early left ventricular systolic dysfunction in DM by meta-analysis. They analyzed 9 studies including 970 subjects to assess myocardial function in DM patients compared to controls based on myocardial strain obtained by 3D-STI. The authors finally found that 3D-STI might precisely assess the early left ventricle systolic dysfunction in DM. It may have a beneficial impact on the targeted diagnosis of Diabetes and the provision of precise immunotherapy in future clinical work. The manuscript is a good meta-analysis. Good Introduction and materials and Methods. The Discussion sound well. Complete the References.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 89578

**Title:** Application of three-dimensional speckle tracking technique in measuring left ventricular myocardial function in patients with diabetes

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07917190

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Africa

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-12-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-12-07 23:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-12-15 05:48

**Review time:** 7 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting a series of retrospective studies meta-analysis. The research ideas are clear and the work is serious. I suggest to accept it, but it needs to be improved in the following aspects. - In Abstract, please add a brief background introduction to this study. - Core tip is missing. - The Discussion section makes a lot of repetitive descriptions of the background introduction. Please delete this section and streamline the discussion of knowledge that we all knows. - Figures 7-11 are all the presentation of the evaluation results of publication bias of relevant studies according to Egger's test, and it is suggested to be organized together as one Figure. Congratulations on your excellent work.