



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**Manuscript NO:** 58342

**Title:** Endothelin receptor antagonists for the treatment of diabetic nephropathy: A meta-analysis and systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 00503195

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-22 16:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-23 10:58

**Review time:** 18 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The submitted metanalysis deals with the interesting topic of new therapeutic interventions against diabetic nephropathy. The authors followed a right methodology and described their findings in a well-written and compact manuscript. The study provides several interesting results with some of them, such as the effect of ETA-R blockers dose of eGFR, being new, and suggest the need for further RCTs. For all these reasons, I suggest accepting the manuscript as is.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**Manuscript NO:** 58342

**Title:** Endothelin receptor antagonists for the treatment of diabetic nephropathy: A meta-analysis and systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 00597793

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-24 01:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-25 16:49

**Review time:** 1 Day and 15 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This appears to be a well done meta analysis. **ABSTRACT** - Conclusion - The ER reduce albuminuria but not eGFR. Do not say that they reduced renal function decline. You can remove the first 2 sentences of the **INTRO**. Start with "Studies show.." .... In the 2nd paragraph of **INTRO** remove "sufficient" **METHODS** - "...with  $P < 0.1$  and  $I^2 > 50\%$  indicated existing statistically significance[13]" Not clear as written **RESULTS** - Study Quality - substitute "good" for "great" **DISCUSSION** - 1st paragraph- "Thus, ER antagonists largely prevent the development of proteinuria, renal vasoconstriction, renal hypertrophy, and structural injury[18-21]." You show no evidence for preventing vasoconstriction, renal hypertrophy and injury. All you demonstrate is lower albuminuria. **DISCUSSION** - "Nevertheless, ER antagonists will be confronted by formidable competitors, for instance, inhibitors of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor antagonists and sodium-glucose co-transporter 2 (SGLT2), " jut because SGLT protect the kidneys does not preclude use of ET blockers. Rewrite. **CONCLUSION** - ET blockers prevent proteinuria not eGFR decline



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**Manuscript NO:** 58342

**Title:** Endothelin receptor antagonists for the treatment of diabetic nephropathy: A meta-analysis and systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 03490863

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DSc, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-22 04:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-26 08:17

**Review time:** 4 Days and 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This systematic review and meta-analysis concentrates on the efficacy and safety of endothelin receptor blockers in diabetic kidney disease. This is an interesting and current topic. The meta-analysis was performed at high methodological level; the research methodology is described in details. From my point of view, the manuscript can be published after some major revisions. 1. The title: I recommend replacing "antagonist" with "antagonists", as this is not a single drug. 2. Materials and methods: When describing studies included in the meta-analysis, it is useful to highlight the differences in their design, primary and secondary endpoints. 3. Results. It would be great to present the dynamics of clinically significant parameters, such as albuminuria, eGFR, and blood pressure, not only in the form of statistical differences between the group, but also in absolute numbers (if it's possible). 4. Discussion. It should be emphasized that the SONAR study was the largest one in terms of the number of participants and duration of follow-up. Specific details of the SONAR study design, such as assessment of antialbuminuric response before randomization, should be indicated. A premature termination of the Mann `s study with avosentan due to excess of cardiovascular events also need to mention. It is advisable to briefly discuss the possible mechanisms of the side effects, such as fluid retention, anemia and hypoglycemia. 5. The conclusion, in my opinion, could have been more cautious. It should be specified that the renal protective effect of the endothelin receptor antagonists was demonstrated in patients with a combination of elevated albuminuria and decreased eGFR only. It is advisable to identify tasks for future research, based on the results of the study. The ongoing trials in this area are also worth mentioning.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**Manuscript NO:** 58342

**Title:** Endothelin receptor antagonists for the treatment of diabetic nephropathy: A meta-analysis and systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 03490863

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DSc, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-08-24 05:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-21 03:58

**Review time:** 27 Days and 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

The authors finalized the article in accordance with the recommendations of the reviewers. I believe that the article can be published in its current form.