

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 54531

**Title:** Access to insulin delivery devices and glycated haemoglobin in lower-income countries

**Reviewer's code:** 02584466

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Emeritus Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-02-03 16:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-02-05 19:07

**Review time:** 2 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<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 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This report analyzed results of survey of 41 low income countries about important aspects of management of type 1 diabetes and derived a set of recommendations (in the Conclusions section) funded on the findings of the study. This report can be of use in future efforts to improve the management of type 1 diabetes in low-income studies.

The methodology and overall reporting of the study are appropriate. I only have a suggestion for revision of two sentences: (a) The second sentence of the section 2.3 Analysis. Please revise the sentence "When prices, frequencies of HbA1C tests and insulin injections were reported as ranges, with the mean value was used for analysis."

(b) In the fourth paragraph of the Discussion, please revise the sentence "This especially an issue for younger children who may only be receiving does of a couple of units of insulin -".

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 54531

**Title:** Access to insulin delivery devices and glycated haemoglobin in lower-income countries

**Reviewer's code:** 02627036

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Director

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Romania

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-02-03 19:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-02-12 22:29

**Review time:** 9 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<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 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Abstract "There was inadequate public access to HbA1c testing aside from donated supplies, with substantial costs to patients" - I do not see any result to support this proposition. Article The article is interesting but I have some comments: 1.Where does the term: "less-resourced countries"? Who made this classification of countries and in what year? 2.In tile put type 1 diabetes; 3.To find out the cause of what you say in the conclusions, we must also know the prevalence of type 1 diabetes in these countries. Shows some data on the prevalence of diabetes before going into your analysis. 4.POCT is not the gold standard in HbA1c testing. Liquid chromatography is golden standard. If civilized countries have liquid chromatography for HbA1c testing, why would this technique not be introduced in these countries? See here: <https://www.bio-rad.com/en-ro/product/d-10-instrumentation?ID=b69d270d-0aef-473f-ae33-439a56d9128f>

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 54531

**Title:** Access to insulin delivery devices and glycated haemoglobin in lower-income countries

**Reviewer's code:** 00039368

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DA, PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Estonia

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-02-03 13:26

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-02-13 14:01

**Review time:** 10 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 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 well designed, performed and written survey study for the assessment of availability and use of insulin delivery devices and HbA1c testing in 41 less-resourced countries. This study was conducted in 2019 supported by the Life for a Child Program. This study is extension of previous study conducted in 2015. The authors conducted survey in 37 countries. The authors give a sufficiently clear overview about the study background and raised clearly the aim of the study, which is fulfilled. The material studied is large enough and allows to drawn the conclusions. The Results are presented clearly and have been discussed well. The paper is supplied with 7 Tables and one Figure which give very good overview about the results and are presented very clearly and correctly. In addition, the authors present very accurate questionnaire. The authors found that public health systems in less-resourced countries are unable to provide access to appropriate injection devices and HbA1c testing for people with diabetes. This paper has also important clinical outcome because pay attention on possible recommendations for ameliorating the situation.

## **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 54531

**Title:** Access to insulin delivery devices and glycated haemoglobin in lower-income countries

**Reviewer's code:** 00039368

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DA, PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Estonia

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Qiao Wang (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-30 07:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-30 11:34

**Review time:** 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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>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 well designed, performed and written survey study for the assessment of availability and use of insulin delivery devices and HbA1c testing in 41 less-resourced countries. This paper has also important clinical outcome because pay attention on possible recommendations for ameliorating the situation and can be accepted in present form.