# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84664

**Title:** Diabetes more than retinopathy, it's effect on the anterior segment of eye

**Provenance and peer review**: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05457585

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Bangladesh

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-23 13:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-25 04:27

**Review time:** 1 Day and 14 Hours

| Scientific quality | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Very good   [  ] Grade C: Good<br>[ Y] Grade D: Fair   [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| Novelty of this manuscript | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [ Y] Grade B: Good   [  ] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [ Y] Grade B: Good   [  ] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [   ] Grade A: Excellent    [   ] Grade B: Good    [ Y] Grade C: Fair [   ] Grade D: No scientific significance |
|---|---|
| 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   [ Y] Major revision   [   ] Rejection |
| Re-review | [ Y] Yes   [   ] No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [   ] Anonymous   [ Y] Onymous |
|  | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.   2. The discussion section is modest.   3. Abstract: not properly written.   4. Conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.   5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning.   6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.   7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84664

**Title:** Diabetes more than retinopathy, it's effect on the anterior segment of eye

**Provenance and peer review**: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05566451

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-04-01 01:06

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-04-07 14:51

**Review time:** 6 Days and 13 Hours

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [ ] Grade A: Excellent  [ ] Grade B: Very good  [ Y] Grade C: Good<br>[ ] Grade D: Fair  [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Novelty of this manuscript** | [ ] Grade A: Excellent  [ Y] Grade B: Good  [ ] Grade C: Fair<br>[ ] Grade D: No novelty |
| **Creativity or innovation of this manuscript** | [ ] Grade A: Excellent  [ Y] Grade B: Good  [ ] Grade C: Fair<br>[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [ Y] Grade B: Good   [  ] Grade C: Fair  [  ] Grade D: No scientific significance |
|---|---|
| **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 |
| **Re-review** | [ Y] Yes   [  ] No |
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous   [  ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [  ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This first such review article will highlight the role of diagnosing and treating patients with a plethora of anterior–segment diseases associated with diabetes, which are often neglected.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent　[  ] Grade B: Very good　[ Y] Grade C: Good<br>[  ] Grade D: Fair　[  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Language quality** | [  ] Grade A: Priority publishing　[ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing<br>[  ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[  ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [  ] Accept (High priority)　[  ] Accept (General priority)<br>[ Y] Minor revision　[  ] Major revision　[  ] Rejection |
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [  ] Anonymous　[ Y] Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: [  ] Yes　[ Y] No |

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.