

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82704

Title: What's old is new again: insights into diabetic foot Microbiome

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05743300

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Honorary Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Czech Republic

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-02 15:00

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-02 15:18

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The review is of a sufficient quality to be published upon the completion of minor revisions. Firstly, it would be advisable for the authors to specify in those figures that are not of their own creation whether they have obtained permission from the original authors for reproduction. Secondly, the formatting of the bibliography appears to be somewhat confusing, and it is not clear if it adheres to the journal's guidelines. It would be the editor's responsibility to verify this. On page 23, there are three lines highlighted in yellow, which could imply that there are a few observations that need to be addressed between the authors that were not checked prior to the submission of the article. In summary, if the authors address these minor recommendations, the article should be accepted.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82704

Title: What's old is new again: insights into diabetic foot Microbiome

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03809896

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-26

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-07 17:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-14 20:24

Review time: 7 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

I think the topic of the manuscript is interesting and the authors have done a good job in this review.