

Peer Reviews & Rebuttal - MS no: 82651

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Novelty of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Creativity or Innovation of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Scientific Significance of the Conclusion in This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Specific comments to Authors: 1. The manuscript focus on Management of Diabetes: Current Concepts, after checked the references in PubMed, many references about Diabetes, but I think this review was more comprehensive and specific. 2. Very interesting, from PATHOPHYSIOLOGY OF DIABESITY, MAJOR COMORBIDITIES TO BE ADDRESSED IN MANAGING DIABESITY, LIFESTYLE MEASURES, DRUG THERAPY, to BARIATRIC PROCEDURES, must let readers including me understand so much current concepts about diabetes

3. In MAJOR COMORBIDITIES TO BE ADDRESSED IN MANAGING DIABESITY part, such as MAFLD was Italic font ; but other part was normal font.

- Response: The font has been formatted appropriately to non-italic.

4. A figure depicting the mechanism of Diabetes can be included.

- This has been included in the manuscript as figure 1. Thank you for this suggestion.

5. The manuscript focus on GLP-1 receptor agonists and SGLT-2 inhibitors introduction containing Figures and Tables, what is reason?

- GLP-1 inhibitors and SGLT-2 antagonists are the two classes of medication that have been widely researched and published in the last few years, with new data to suggest their significant impact on weight and cardiovascular health. Hence these 2 medication classes have been an area of focus. We have amended the text in the manuscript to reflect this more clearly.

6. The words in Figure 3 not very clear, I think should change another font.

- The font has been formatted for all figures in the amended submission.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Novelty of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Creativity or Innovation of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Scientific Significance of the Conclusion in This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Specific comments to Authors: The prevalence of obesity and diabetes is rapidly rising worldwide with adiposity considered the strongest risk factor for developing diabetes. Diabesity, a term that is defined as the combined adverse health effects of obesity and diabetes mellitus, is becoming an increasing concern given how interlinked the two conditions are with effective prevention, management and treatments urgently required. The manuscript under review entitled 'Management of Diabesity: Current Concepts,' aimed to provide an overview of the evidence-based management of diabesity. Overall, the manuscript is well written, providing an up-to-date overview of the evidence on an important and timely topic.

The manuscript could however be improved by stating how this manuscript differs from the many other reviews on diabesity (prior to stating the aim in the introduction) ...

- We have included a statement at the end of the introduction section to explain this.

...as well as adequately highlighting where research in diabesity is still in its infancy and future steps needed to advance research in this field (end of the concluding paragraph).

- This information is included in the future considerations section. We have amended the conclusion to include this as well.

In addition to this, the following should be revised to enhance the quality of the manuscript: 1. In the introduction, in the first sentence '3 decades' should be written as 'three decades.'

- This has been amended

2. Also, in the introduction, the second sentence 'adverse lifestyle' should be corrected as 'adverse lifestyle behaviors.'

- This has been corrected

3. In the last sentence of 'Pathophysiology of Diabetes,' it would be better if authors could modify this sentence 'Linking to excess fat consumption, research suggests that excess lipid intake may result in bacterial production of short chain fatty acids, which in turn affect energy balance and metabolism' - so it is in line with the body of evidence to date. The body of evidence to date is actually conflicting on this, with some research suggesting that short chain fatty acids can help protect against metabolic dysfunction and high fat diet induced obesity (DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2021.02.001>).

- This has been amended. Thank you for your input.

4. Under the subheading of 'Dietary Modifications' it is more ideal to discuss weight loss as 'percentage weight loss' as opposed to 'kilos' so it is clinically meaningful.

- Data has been reported as stated in the relevant clinical trials and papers cited, therefore we are unable to make this change unless it was included in the original referencing paper

Reviewer 3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The topic is of interest, and the manuscript is well illustrated. Major Comments:

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.

- We have amended the manuscript to make this point clearer. Research around GLP-1 and SGLT-2 inhibitors have had significant recent publication back up.

2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?

- The discussion section has been amended accordingly to improve the manuscript quality as suggested.

3. Conclusion: not properly written.

- The conclusion section is now amended to include more clear information

4. 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.

- The relevant sections have been amended now in the marked revision.

5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.

- The discussion had been already done for a good quality review. However, modifications have been done considering the comments by other reviewers also.

6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

- We have now done a detailed recheck of the entire manuscript and corrected any spelling or grammatical errors

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.

- The manuscript has been amended to the best of our ability and language errors have been rectified.

Revision reviewer:

Specific Comments To Authors: The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning.

Reply: Unfortunately, this reviewer's comments were non-specific and unhelpful to make meaningful modifications of the manuscript.!

However, we have made some additional revisions to improve the manuscript quality in the attached highlighted revision.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS #4

Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Answer: Thanks for the suggestions and we have made modifications in the whole manuscript to incorporate all the review comments and editors' comments

Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Diabetes, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to

the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s). If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *World J Gastroenterol* 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable.

Answer: Thanks for the suggestions and we have now provided the modified figures and taken care of all the review comments and modified the whole paper.

We hope the modified manuscript after incorporating suggestions from the review comments and editors' advice would meet the publication standards of *World Journal of Diabetes*.