

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 41327

Title: Guidelines and controversies in the management of diabetic ketoacidosis - A minireview

Reviewer's code: 00058696

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2018-08-07

Date reviewed: 2018-08-12

Review time: 5 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This new manuscript has been carefully examined. My major questions are summarized below: 1) Title: The focus of this manuscript is not on utilization of resources in patients treated for diabetic ketoacidosis. This manuscript is written as a



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

practice management of a specific complication in individuals with diabetes mellitus. I would suggest that a new title should be considered. 2) Introduction: i. “there were 140,000 hospitalizations”. Where? This is an international journal. ii. For the sentence starting with “While a national survey conducted in”: this is not a complete sentence, and so it needs to be rewritten. 3) Methods: What sites were reviewed or searched? What search terms were used? 4) “Bags of Fluid”; volume of bags must be very clear. 5) This manuscript would be greatly improved with several small summary Tables: such as for Current Guidelines; Controversies; Special Populations; and New Guidelines to be Considered. 6) In References: the Fonts do not appear to match.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

二审意见:

To the Editor:



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

I have reexamined this manuscript.

This manuscript is now submitted as a mini-review rather than as an Editorial.

The authors have rewritten this manuscript and have addressed all of the suggestions that I had previously made. I believe that this manuscript warrants publication at this time because it makes an important addition to our literature with regards to management of a major complication of diabetes mellitus.

Thank you for allowing us to participate in this important peer review process.

Very truly yours

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 41327

Title: Guidelines and controversies in the management of diabetic ketoacidosis - A minireview

Reviewer's code: 00573611

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2018-09-03

Date reviewed: 2018-09-07

Review time: 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this literature review, the authors focused to analyze healthcare resource utilization in the treatment of Diabetic Ketoacidosis (DKA). The authors concluded that there is a need for new protocol where treatment with subcutaneous insulin versus IV insulin infusion,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

“one bag protocol” versus “two bag protocol”, and management of DKA in special populations should be addressed. Comments This is an interesting mini-review article. The manuscript is well-written. The reviewer has some minor concerns as follows: 1. Revise the DKA with full name in the title of manuscript. 2. Add the page number. 3. There are some typing errors, for example, in “Treatment strategy for DKA” section, “Current guidelines recommends to initiate volume...” (recommend). 4. Revise the fonts in the References that should be consistent for each list reference.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No