

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 63412

Title: Prediabetes and cardiovascular complications study: Highlights on gestational diabetes, self-management and primary health care

Reviewer's code: 05249132

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: Nigeria

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-02 23:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-14 19:04

Review time: 11 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The paper has some interesting data and insights, but it should be restructured, so that it is easier to understand the message. First of all, as there are several studies reported in the paper, the information on them should be structured in a way that the reader clearly sees in which section data from which study is presented and a more straightforward connection between them is necessary. A brief description of these studies (number of participants, regions, period, goal and procedures) should be provided in a systematic manner. The sections between introduction and discussion should be divided in a way that the reader can distinguish between materials and methods, and results parts of the paper. By the end of the paper it is still unclear, what is the particular place of GDM in all the studies and what is the core finding of the paper (supported by the data). The language should be revised. Some sentences are hard to read and there is a terminology not suitable for scientific papers (e.g. “gravida”, “blue collar jobs” etc.). The concept of behavioral change wheel should be described in the paper. The list of stakeholders mentioned in the paper should be formalized. The estimations of 55 million healthcare workers in diabetes care required for Nigeria healthcare system is doubtful. A more careful analysis on this point is required. In the description of each figure and table the information on a particular study to which this figure/table refers is necessary (otherwise it might be unclear for the reader, e.g., why are there male responders in GDM study). All the figures should be simple bar/pie graphs (and not 3d versions) in order to make it easy to read percentages. Fig. 3 does not carry any meaningful information. In table 2 it is doubtful that kurtosis and skewness have any meaning for presented metrics.