PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78262

Title: Diabetes and skin cancers: risk factors, molecular mechanisms and impact on prognosis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05857226

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PharmD

Professional title: Chief Pharmacist, Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-15 09:12

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-15 11:16

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, Thank you very much for the opportunity to read and comment on your manuscript. This is interesting topic and well written manuscript. I have no comments regarding the composition of the manuscript. However, I have some comments that would substantially increase the quality of your work. Diabetes classification has changed. I recommend to classify diabetes in line with the latest ADA guidelines (doi.org/10.2337/dc21-S002) and correct the manuscript accordingly. Line 140. "Currently, half a million individuals suffer from diabetes…."You meant on half billion, can you clarify? Line 441. There is no proof from randomized clinical trials that any anti-diabetic drug has any impact on cancer incidence per se. There are positive results from prospective or retrospective cohort trials, but this is still matter of debate to draw firm conclusion. I suggest to emphasize this in the manuscript.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78262

Title: Diabetes and skin cancers: risk factors, molecular mechanisms and impact on prognosis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05947685

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-21 16:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-28 12:26

Review time: 6 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review, the authors discussed abouth the association between dabetes and skin cancers in several aspects, including epidemiological data, clinical management, and underlying molecular mechanisms. Although, the topic is of interest, the review itself has many limitations in term of synthesizing the core knowledge for people in the field or even for general audineces. They may consider thoroughly revising and re-submiting after the quality of the manuscript have been improved. Major concerns: 1. In the topic "Epidemiology of diabetes and skin cancer", the authors should comprehensively review all studies that show the effects of diabetes and skin cancer development and/or progression. To summary the asscoiation between these two diseases, they will need to mention the results of the original studies in term of relative risk (Odds ratio, Risk ratio, Harzard ratio), 95% Confidence Interval, and P value (not just P value), to make th readers be convinced with how large and how precise of the effects from statistical analysis. The table of summary of all related studies is highly recommended.   2. In the topic "Is diabetes a risk factor for skin cancer?", the authors need to explain specifically to skin cancer, nost jut the overview of the data that may be related to other cancers. The given information now is too broad and probably true for general cancers. However, the information for skin cancers which is the main focus of the present article is too limited. If this is because of a few stduies in skin cancer available, it must be also mentioned. 3. In the part of molecular mechanisms, it needs to emphasize which reports are from the original studies of skin cancers and which are from the other cancers that the authors added to support their idea. It is not clear for the specificity of molecular mechanisms underlying the association betwen diabetes and skin cancer. The diagrams or figures

demonstrating the mechanisms would be very helpful. 4. In the topic of "Evolution and management of skin cancers in pateints with diabetes", the authors discuss about the complications in patients with skin cancer who have diabetes. This point is, however, the general complications of diabetes on every pateints/patients with other cancers and not specific for skin cancers in terms of underlying mechanisms that DM may affect the prognosis of skin cancer. This part should be more focused. 5. There are a lot of available studies for the effects of metformin on melanoma. This information should be included when the authors disucssed about the effects of anti-diabetic drugs. Those data related to other cancers may not be important. The summary table for each drug's effect on skin cancer is highly recommended.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing
	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)
	[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, I'm sorry that I didn't participate in the review of this manuscript （Manuscript NO.: 78262）, so I can't re-review again. Can you withdraw my invitation?

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

| **statements** | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have revised and addressed all points as per the suggestions of this reviewer. This manuscript may be accepted with the current version.