

Review comments & Rebuttal – MS no: 82096

Reviewer #1: In the present scientific paper, the authors introduce the “Diabetes and Cognitive Function: An Evidence-based Current Perspective”. In detail, the paper is good, but I have some concerns about the article which are listed as follows: o There are some minor grammatical errors in the text. Please control the text in that manner. o Please modify the abstract format (A concise and factual abstract is required). o The important point is that to improve the manuscript (novelty), the authors should at least try to do an extensive discussion/critical comparison of the clinical trials (results) with previous reports. Therefore, the authors should represent the clinical trials (investigations) and proper related tables.

Answer: Thanks for the comments and suggestions which we have incorporated in the highlighted revision. The entire manuscript is now checked and corrected the grammar and language errors. The abstract is now modified to summarise the whole content of the paper. Although we made extensive literature search on PubMed to review the best evidence available from randomised controlled clinical trials (search terms “diabetes” AND “dementia” or “diabetes” AND “cognitive function/dysfunction”) we couldn’t find much good quality intervention trials in the disease management. Therefore, we have now incorporated few new paragraphs under the subheadings ‘Other comorbidities/risk factors potentially impacting cognitive dysfunction in diabetes’ and ‘Clinical trials on modifiable risk factors of cognitive dysfunction among patients with diabetes’ and included a table each in these new sections to address the reviewer’s suggestions.

Reviewer #2: This invited study entitled “Diabetes and Cognitive Function: An Evidence-based Current Perspective” seems to have been generally well executed and written. Furthermore, I believe that this work will be of great interest to the readers. Finally, I have only two remarks to further improve the quality of the paper. Short title It is too long. (e.g., Diabetes and Cognitive Function) Methodology Although, this paper is review, and not a systematic review (I presume a narrative review), in my opinion, a short section named Methodology should be included in the article. It should contain the type of review, which databases where searched, in which time

period, was there any language restriction, by which authors, and which author approved the final list of included studies.

Answer: Thanks for the effort and time taken by the reviewer for peer reviewing our paper to suggest modifications. As suggested, we have now changed the short title and added 2 paragraphs to summarise how we compiled the evidence for this narrative review under the subheading review methodology.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS #3

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Answer: Thanks for the suggestions and we have made language modifications as advised.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Diabetes, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the

picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Answer: Thanks for the suggestions and we have now provided the modified figures as Power point file as advised. The corresponding author Prof. JM Pappachan already has an RCA account which is updated periodically.

We have complied with all the suggestions by editors and reviewers in the revision of the paper.

We hope the modified manuscript after incorporating suggestions from the review comments and editors' advice would meet the publication standards of World Journal of Diabetes.