



**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: 37699

Title: The effect of glucagon-like peptide 1 analogs in combination with insulin on myocardial infarct size in rats with type 2 diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 00506360

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-27

Date reviewed: 2018-03-31

Review time: 4 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" 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

Nicely designed prospective, non randomized study showing that pretreatment with insulin increases infarct size and that infarct size decreased with GLP-1 pretreatment. The hypoglycemia and glycemic excursion data are of little consequence and should be

removed. An hypothesis as to why insulin pretreatment reduced infarct size should be included. Otherwise the statistical methods are appropriate and the conclusions drawn from the data are logical. The Abstract succinctly describes the content of the manuscript which is well referenced. The Figures and Tables of the experiment and its outcomes add to the quality of the manuscript.

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: 37699

Title: The effect of glucagon-like peptide 1 analogs in combination with insulin on myocardial infarct size in rats with type 2 diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 02888410

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-27

Date reviewed: 2018-04-10

Review time: 14 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Some small changes are needed. Introduction: First paragraph is not related with the work performed. Erase it and maintain only the two last lines "These blood glucose targets are very difficult to achieve using insulin monotherapy, which has a high risk of

hypoglycemia and glycemic variability that can increase the risk of complications in MI[11-13]" and rephrase it to fix to the second paragraph. The end of the second paragraph repeated the aim that it expressed at the end of "Introduction". Mix both aims or erase one of them. Design: How were compared discrete variables? Discussion: Were are the conclusions? "The ratio of the myocardial ischemic zone to the necrotic zone was the worst in the rats treated with insulin before induction of ischemia, which confirmed the superior effectiveness of the existing protocols for managing patients with T2DM using insulin therapy during MI." What want the authors mind? I do not understand this conclusion.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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