



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 42699

Title: The effect of SGLT-2 inhibitors on NAFLD in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus
- a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02446526

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-10-06

Date reviewed: 2018-10-10

Review time: 4 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General Comments: The manuscript entitled: "The effect of SGLT-2 inhibitors on NAFLD in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus - a systematic review; Manuscript ID: WJD-42699" was read with interest. Although the study results may be of interest to the

global scientific audience, there are several technical flaws and occasional language errors throughout the paper that I have pointed out below. Specific Comments: Language and style: There are occasional language errors (grammar, syntax and even spellings) in the manuscript the need corrections. Therefore, authors are recommended to rectify these by a thorough scrutiny of the entire manuscript probably with the help of a language expert. Abstract: It is worth mentioning the total number cases analysed in the entire study and both RCTs & observational cohorts to give readers a perspective of the impact of the intervention with SGLT-2 inhibitors. You should change the conclusion section completely and mention “based on (low-grade/ moderate) level of evidence, SGLT-2i appears to improve hepatic ? parameters”. As this is a systematic review, you may also suggest future implications of research here. Introduction: Grammar errors in the third sentence of first paragraph and second sentence of the third paragraph (please change these types of errors in the entire manuscript by thorough scrutiny; I am unable to point out each as there are several of them). Modify the third sentence in the third paragraph as the statement is not fully correct scientifically. Methods: This section should clearly define the primary and secondary outcome measures. It appears as if you look at the effects of SGLT-2i on NAFLD as primary outcomes in the study, but this should be consistent throughout the paper (the results and discussion sections are not mentioning much about the same).! Currently, the authors giggle between diabetes, insulin resistance, BMI and NAFLD outcomes without a focused systematic approach to the review that doesn't appear scientifically very sound. The search strategy and key word search are mentioned as very vague in this section and I can't understand how you combined the search queries. It would be worth reporting the search strategy as a table in the supplementary files to ensure the search is reproducible to the reviewer/ reader. The Cochrane collaboration doesn't recommend combining RCTs and observational studies in the same systematic reviews that is one of

the major limitations of your study. However, it is worth reporting this study considering the implications of the outcomes on clinical practice. Please also mention whether there was an intention for quantitative synthesis from the study in the methods section, and if not performed, the reason for the same (especially because this appears to be an intervention review). Results: It's worth mentioning the number of cases in each RCTs in table 1 to give readers the statistical power of the outcome measures. It would be ideal to combine the effects of intervention on NAFLD in a single table (ALT, AST & GGT changes) rather than putting them separately in different tables. Again, the metabolic parameters may also be combined in to a single table (if possible). The results section should be shortened by reducing the bulk of details about secondary outcomes such as metabolic and lipid parameters as these are not the main aim of your study Discussion: This section should also be shortened to focus mainly on NAFLD outcomes of the intervention and possible mechanisms (currently the discussion looks quite laborious and narrative) rather than detailed discussion on metabolic, body weight and BMI outcomes and side effects. Please also focus on the quality and quantity of evidence of the drug intervention on NAFLD as that is what is required for the scientific fraternity. The major limitation of the study is the low number of cases in trials and the population (Japanese) studied that reduce the generalizability of the results. It is also worth mentioning if these studies were pharma sponsored too. Conclusions: You have to weaken the claims in this section as it sounds like these class of drugs are remedies for NAFLD based on the review (that even based on low quality evidence!). References: this section may need modification while making the revision avoiding unwanted ones.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[] The same title



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

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ Y No

BPG Search:

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ Y No



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 42699

Title: The effect of SGLT-2 inhibitors on NAFLD in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus
- a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02951258

Reviewer's country: Ukraine

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-10-25

Date reviewed: 2018-10-30

Review time: 5 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The main topic of the review "The effect of SGLT-2 inhibitors on NAFLD in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus - a systematic review" is interesting, so the article will be of interest to physicians. There are several language, grammar errors throughout the paper.

The authors should write clearly the information about the included RCTs & observational studies, including the numbers of patients and they characteristics. The authors should clearly define the primary and secondary outcome measures. According to the title and aim of the review the effects of SGLT-2 on NAFLD was a primary outcome, so authors should give more detailed information according to this aspect (namely describe the influence of SGLT-2 based on the hard data). The results section should be enlarged by increasing the information about the primary outcome and probably shortened by reducing the secondary outcome section. Discussion section should also be more focused mainly on NAFLD. The citations should be given throughout the text accordingly. English should be polished.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 42699

Title: The effect of SGLT-2 inhibitors on NAFLD in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus
- a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02584466

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-10-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-06

Review time: 18 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

This manuscript presents a systematic review of the published studies analyzing the effects of SGLT-2 inhibitors on nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in patients with type 2 diabetes. The methodology of the report is appropriate and its presentation clear. I

have a few suggestions for a few minor changes in the report: (A) Page 3, Abstract, Results section, line 4 from bottom: Change "glycaemic" to "glycaemia" (B) Page 5, Introduction, line 3 from top: Change "It's prevalence" to "Its prevalence" (C) Page 15, Discussion, line 11 from top: While osmotic diuresis definitely decreases body weight, it is an adverse effect of glucosuria because it causes symptomatic, and in advanced cases potentially life threatening, hypovolemia. My suggestion is to add a statement that unlike the other weight-reducing effects of SGLT-2 inhibitors, which are potentially beneficial, osmotic diuresis is clearly an adverse effect.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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