

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal:	World	Journal of	Clinical	Cases
------------------	-------	------------	----------	-------

Manuscript NO: 81054

Title: DIABETIC FOOT ULCER: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF

PATHOPHYSIOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT MODALITIES.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03372482 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-23 07:34

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-23 07:41

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No



https://www.wjgnet.com

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Diabetic foot ulcers (DFU) are a debilitating and severe manifestation of uncontrolled and prolonged diabetes that presents as ulceration, usually located to the plantar aspect of the foot. Approximately 15% of individuals with diabetes will eventually develop one of these ulcers, and out of these individuals, 14-24% of them will require amputation of the ulcerated foot due to bone infection or other ulcer-related complications. The pathologic mechanisms of DFU are described in terms of a triad: neuropathy, vascular insufficiency, and secondary infection due to trauma of the foot. Standard local and invasive care along with novel approaches like stem cell therapy paves the way to reduce morbidity, decrease amputations, and prevent mortality from DFU. In this manuscript, we review the literature for the current pathophysiology, preventive options, and definitive management of diabetic foot ulcers. In General: it's a good paper and the subject of the manuscript is applicable and useful. Title: the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article Abstract: abstract contains an appropriate summary for the article, the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand, and there are no suggestions for improvement. Introduction: authors do provide adequate background on the topic and reason for this article and describe what the authors hoped to achieve. Results: the results are presented clearly, the authors provide accurate research results, and there is sufficient evidence for each result. Conclusion: in general: Good and the research provides sample data for the authors to make their conclusion. Grammar: Need Some revision. (Check The Paper Comments). Please provide and edit the following information in the Paper 1. Conflict of Interest. 2. Source of Funding. 3. Some references without DOI. 4. Writing references according to the terms of the journal.



7. The result and discussion must be in one paragraph. Finally, this was an attractive article. In its current state, it adds much new insightful information to the field.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal:	World	Journal of	Clinical	Cases
------------------	-------	------------	----------	-------

Manuscript NO: 81054

Title: DIABETIC FOOT ULCER: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF

PATHOPHYSIOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT MODALITIES.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04213605 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: BSc

Professional title: Teaching Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Singapore

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-22 23:37

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-26 06:38

Review time: 3 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [<mark>Y</mark>] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] 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



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

https://www.wjgnet.com

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript lacks depth and is poorly written as advancements in this area are only summarized by the authors but not discussed. More detailed information should be included and discussed. .



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal:	World	Journal of	Clinical	Cases
------------------	-------	------------	----------	-------

Manuscript NO: 81054

Title: DIABETIC FOOT ULCER: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF

PATHOPHYSIOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT MODALITIES.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05667559 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Poland

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-22

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-05 13:06

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-13 16:32

Review time: 8 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] 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) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



https://www.wjgnet.com

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? No. Should be improved- comment in the text Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? No, I have not found any information about the key used by the authors when reviewing the literature, e.g. - the last 10 years? what database did they look at? Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Not applicable Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice All my comments are within the text. sufficiently? References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite Over 50% of the references are more than 10 years and/or over-cite references? old...to prove that the authors' article is needed on the publishing market they should update the literature. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style,



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable? This is not a systematic review. Ethics statements. Not appl;icable



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal:	World	Journal of	Clinical	Cases
------------------	-------	------------	----------	-------

Manuscript NO: 81054

Title: DIABETIC FOOT ULCER: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF

PATHOPHYSIOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT MODALITIES.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06140863 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-22

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-07 10:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-14 21:33

Review time: 7 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] 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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have carried out a coherent and descriptive review of the literature on the pathophysiology and management modalities of diabetic foot ulcers. In order to improve the quality of the work, I suggest that the authors add a table that includes the level of recommendation for each of the practices used in ulcer management and the degree of evidence in the academic literature. An interesting example can be found in the update on the management of diabetic foot ulcers written by Estelle Everett and Nestoras Mathioudakis (doi:10.1111/nyas.13569).