

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 83517

Title: TIGHT JUNCTIONS DISRUPTION AND THE PATHOGENESIS OF THE CHRONIC COMPLICATIONS OF DIABETES MELLITUS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368358

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Mexico

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-30 03:51

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-04 09:41

Review time: 5 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Title should contain “review article” with its types i.e. systematic or narrative (traditional / educational) or Meta-analysis. 2. Some words should also be added in title i.e. “TIGHT JUNCTIONS AND THE CHRONIC COMPLICATIONS OF DIABETES MELLITUS – A (NARRATIVE OR EDUCATIONAL OR) REVIEW”. 3. Abstract should be corrected as per the suggestions mentioned as comments in the manuscript (word file). Some sentences must be checked and corrected. 4. Objectives are not mentioned clearly. 5. Background is well elaborated in Introduction but rationale of the review is not properly mentioned. 6. Authors have written that they had searched systematically. Hence, searching methods should be elaborated. 7. Observations of searching should also be mentioned (as flow diagram or textual). 8. Some explanations must be quoted (as commented in manuscript). 9. Whole article is mainly on the basis of previous researches and published articles. There is lack of personal thinking or 10ritical analysis on the matter which searched and identified by the authors. Though two algorithms related to the matter was drawn, critical analysis on the searched matter is mandatory in review and will increase the weightage of the article. 11. How the matter should be

useful (strength) and limitation of the review must have to be mentioned. 12. All other (small/linguistic) changes suggested as comment box in the manuscript must be checked and revise the article accordingly.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 83517

Title: TIGHT JUNCTIONS DISRUPTION AND THE PATHOGENESIS OF THE CHRONIC COMPLICATIONS OF DIABETES MELLITUS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04726030

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Academic Fellow, Academic Research, Lecturer, Research Fellow, Senior Postdoctoral Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nigeria

Author's Country/Territory: Mexico

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-19 14:25

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-02 09:01

Review time: 10 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First I appreciate the authors for summarizing the recent findings of TJ disruption and increase in paracellular permeability at different organ barriers that are associated with diabetic complications. I suggest that immediately after the background, a methodology section should be included. In it you can state the following "We systematically searched PubMed and Google Scholar databases to identifies articles about TJs and diabetes". Also use the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA) as part of the databases to retrieve more relevant and recent articles. The method section should include period of literature search, possible key words for the search, type of articles included in this review, language of articles, article access type, and the type of literature review conducted/design adopted (e.g. narrative or discursive etc) and the rationale. Next sections should then be termed discussion (heading). Just before the conclusion section, authors need to include a heading "Implications" and thoroughly discuss the



**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

lessons to be taken from their present review so as to clearly point out the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. Use of graphic illustrations/figures by authors are also encouraged to further highlight the clinical implications and novelty aspect of this paper. The main constraint of the review methodology adopted by the adopted has not be obviously highlighted. The conclusion section needs to be further developed to clearly interpret the paper's findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. Please further improve the language structure and quality of the entire manuscript.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 83517

Title: TIGHT JUNCTIONS DISRUPTION AND THE PATHOGENESIS OF THE CHRONIC COMPLICATIONS OF DIABETES MELLITUS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368358

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Mexico

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-31 16:13

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-01 11:28

Review time: 19 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This is not a pure systematic review. This is narrative or educational review. Because authors have not followed the SALSA or PSALSAR method to evaluate all published manuscripts related to the topic. The matter of the article didn't contain the assessment and evaluation of the articles specifically published on 'tight junction' for their biases and others. The matter of this article are in the favor of narrative review. 2. Figures and tables are not found at anywhere. They are neither available on the website nor in the revised manuscript.