

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 44671

**Title:** “Diabetes in KOKAN region of India”

**Reviewer’s code:** 03465354

**Reviewer’s country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Date sent for review:** 2018-11-26

**Date reviewed:** 2018-11-29

**Review time:** 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The aim of the proposed manuscript by Suvarna et al. entitled “Diabetes in KOKAN region of India” is to investigate the body composition of patients with diabetes in a rural clinic in Chiplin area of KOKAN region, Maharashtra, India. Study involved total of 312 individuals (168 diabetic and 144 non-diabetic) as history of diabetes,

anthropometric measurements, and body composition (by using bioimpedance method) were recorded. The results showed that underweight and normal weight patients with diabetes have significantly lower body fat percentage, higher muscle mass percentage, lower visceral fat content, and lower basal metabolic rate, compared to their overweight counterparts. Main conclusion the authors draw is that body mass index cannot be used as for accurate assessment for the risk of diabetes, and that further studies in a larger scale are needed to assess the metabolic significance of leanness in KOKAN region. As the authors of the manuscript accurately point out, a major limitation of this work is the limited number of subjects involved as well as the cross-sectional, single-centered character of the study. There is a significant difference between the number and the age of the subjects in both groups (diabetic and non-diabetic). Besides of these limitations, it should be appreciated that this is the first study to correlate body composition parameters in diabetics and non-diabetics in this geographic region. As a peer reviewer for this manuscript, I do not find any issues with the statistical methods or data representation.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

**https://** www.wjgnet.com

[ ] Plagiarism

[ Y ] No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 44671

**Title:** "Diabetes in KOKAN region of India"

**Reviewer's code:** 02446627

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Date sent for review:** 2018-11-26

**Date reviewed:** 2018-12-01

**Review time:** 5 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is very limited but offers a peek at the selected population in India. Need to mention on the analyzer used as to if it is valid tool and has the validity study done on that tool. Grammer and spelling need to be checked. At least use the spell and grammar correction tool It also mention that in our study 40% of them had genetic

predisposition to diabetes. I don't see the data nor clear explanation

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 44671

**Title:** “Diabetes in KOKAN region of India”

**Reviewer’s code:** 00506276

**Reviewer’s country:** Poland

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Date sent for review:** 2018-11-26

**Date reviewed:** 2018-12-06

**Review time:** 9 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the present study authors present anthropometric and metabolic characteristics of 168 patients with type 2 diabetes in comparison to 144 healthy control subjects in the Kokan region. The major findings are that: (1) total and visceral fat content does not differ between diabetic and non-diabetic males but is higher in diabetic than in non-diabetic

women, (2) muscle mass expressed as the percentage of body weight does not differ between diabetic and non-diabetic subjects irrespectively of sex whereas absolute muscle mass is higher in diabetic than in non-diabetic men, (2) basal metabolic rate is lower in diabetic patients, (4) body mass index is higher in diabetic than in non-diabetic females. Although the findings are of some interest, there are important concerns which should be addressed. 1) Paragraph 3: patients inclusion/exclusion criteria should be presented in Methods, not Results. 2) Paragraph 3.1, lines 3-5: the discrepancy about family history of diabetes should be clarified. 3) Paragraph 3.2, line 2: the discrepancy regarding muscle mass should be clarified. 4) Greater muscle mass should be expected to be associated with improved glucose metabolism. The finding that muscle mass was higher in diabetic vs. non-diabetic males is unexpected and should be discussed

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 44671

**Title:** “Diabetes in KOKAN region of India”

**Reviewer’s code:** 00058696

**Reviewer’s country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Date sent for review:** 2018-11-26

**Date reviewed:** 2018-12-07

**Review time:** 10 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This new manuscript has been carefully examined. My major questions are summarized below: 1) In Abstract, Conclusion: the authors should consider adding a sentence after the sentence that ends with “diabetes in them” to consider “A genetic predisposition appears to be an important factor in this patient population”. 2) In



Introduction, after paragraph 3, the authors should summarize their hypothesis for this study and then present the Aims of their study. 3) In Discussion, the authors may wish to consider describing the potential linkage between amino acid deficiency and pancreatic disease. 4) In Discussion, are the genetic results that were identified by the authors related to consanguinity within families in this district? 5) In Discussion, consider starting a new paragraph after “the data on body composition”. The next paragraph in Discussion should then start with “Limitations of this study include”; in this paragraph, the authors should mention that they did not use a statistical correction for the mean age differences between the study groups and that they did not present a multivariate analysis in this study. 6) Table 1 should be a Table 1A (which could include Data +/- SD) and Table 1B (which could include Date (% of entire population). In Table 1, the authors need to better comment in their Discussion on why there is a major difference between diabetic Men and Women with regards to Microvascular complication (is this a genetic disorder?). My minor questions are summarized below: 1) Introduction, paragraph 3, line 5: “substatntial” is not spelled properly. 2) Results, line 2: consider “and” after “chronic illness,”. 3) Results, paragraph 2: in sentence 2 consider “were significantly younger ( $p = \dots$ ). In sentence 4, consider “No control subject had a family history of diabetes”. In sentence 6, consider “Height was similar in both sexes comparing diabetic and non-diabetic”. 4) In Discussion, line 4: the sentence “Our study is not the prevalence” does not make sense and needs to be rewritten. Line 28, consider “BMR was significantly lower in the lean group” and consider “Possible explanation for this finding may be the metabolic response”. The sentence starting “Visceral fat (VF) in excess has been linked” does not make sense and needs to be rewritten. Consider “compared to other Asian populations”. Before Walawalkar hospital, consider “further study”.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No