

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 52045

Title: Long-term effect of clopidogrel in patients with and without diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer's code: 00058696

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's country: United States

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-16 11:27

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-25 00:52

Review time: 8 Days and 13 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input 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 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

I have carefully read this new manuscript. My major questions are summarized below: 1) This work is not presently organized as a scientific manuscript. The background for this study is provided in the Discussion, paragraph 3. This information should be moved to the Introduction. The authors can then provide a hypothesis for this study. In the present Introduction, the authors begin with the phrase “Recent studies”, but reference 7 is from 2012. 2) In the Introduction, the authors need to be clear how their study will provide information that adds to the present literature (e.g. References 10, 11, and 12). 3) If a studied effect does not reach statistical significance, then it cannot be used to form a conclusion. If the authors believe that the study size is too small, then they should state that. The phrase “was lessened in diabetics” is incorrect and should not be used. In the Results, under “Effect of clopidogrel by diabetes status”, the authors state “significantly lowered the risk”, but they provide a p-value of 0.26. In the next sentence of this section, the authors provide a statement based on a p-value of 0.74. 4) In Discussion, the authors state that the results of Reference 7 are “not consistent with our findings”. Results presented from Reference 7 are with regards to 1-year all-cause death and cardiovascular death. The present authors however in Table 1 have included studies of patients with “high-risk TIA” (Chance 2013 and Point 2018), “multiple risk factors” (Charism 2006), and “those would undergo elective PCI (?what does this mean?)” (Credo 2002). It is unclear how these studies contribute to an understanding of 1-year cardiovascular death when compared to Reference 7 (in which subjects were enrolled for that study after a myocardial infarction). These are clearly different study groups. 5) In Discussion, under limitations. It is unclear whether the six studies included in this present analysis contained patients with poorly controlled diabetes. Were Hemoglobin A1C levels provided for the diabetic subjects in these six studies? Is it not likely that clopidogrel may not be as effective in individuals with poorly controlled diabetes? Minor Issues:



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

1) In the Introduction the authors use the sentence “effect of clopidogrel is weaken with the present of diabetes is still limited and unsummarized”. I have no idea what this means. I would suggest obtaining an English consultation. 2) When the authors use the word “weaken”, I believe that they mean “reduce”. 3) There are two separate “Table 1”. The second Table 1 should be included in the Results section and is not needed as a separate Table. 4) Table 2 is not needed. Exclusion criteria can be summarized in Methods. 5) First Table 1 and Table 3 are repetitive.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 52045

Title: Long-term effect of clopidogrel in patients with and without diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer's code: 03469224

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Lecturer, Postdoctoral Fellow, Senior Researcher, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's country: Nigeria

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-30 04:48

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-31 10:24

Review time: 1 Day and 5 Hours

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 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

The authors reported a systematic review and meta analysis of randomized control trials on the long term effect of clopidogrel in patients with or without diabetes. Generally, I found the manuscript to be interesting and of importance to the field of diabetes mellitus. However, I have some comments for the authors. Major Comments A major problem I found in this manuscript is the level of usage of English language. Few examples of bad usage of English Language: Abstract: First Line: Diabetic patients were reported..... Core Tip The evidence derivedthe effect of clopidogrel is weaken with the present of diabetes is still..... As far as we know.....by the presence of diabetes Introduction Subgroup datadiabetes weaken the effect of clopidogrel on recurrent cardiovascular events and all-cause death..... The poor usage of English Language as shown above and in some parts of the manuscript, made some parts of the manuscript not to be properly understood. Authors are therefore advised to edit their entire manuscript for English Language, perhaps making use of a native English speaker. Specific Comments Abstract Going by the title and the aim of this review 'to systematically evaluate the efficacy of clopidogrel in treating acute coronary or ischemic stroke among diabetic and non-diabetic patients', it would have been nice if a group that received clopidogrel alone was included in the study. The year range the authors covered in the literature search from the indexing data bases was not stated in the abstract. The use of the word 'diabetics' as seen in the abstract and in different parts of the manuscript should be corrected as its no longer an acceptable terminology. Suggest to correct it to 'people with diabetes mellitus' L11 and L16, p values of 0.26 and 0.74 (at an alpha value of 0.05 that was set as the threshold for statistical significance) cannot be considered to be significant. Authors are advised to recheck. Introduction Page 8, Undefined abbreviations such as: 'HR' and 'CI' should be written in full before abbreviating them for clarity of presentation. Again, P values of 0.26 and 0.74 cannot be considered to be statistically significant. Page 10, consider to define 'STEM' before



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

abbreviating it. Results Suggest to correct the numbering of the Tables. The second 'Table 1' should be 'Table 2'

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 52045

Title: Long-term effect of clopidogrel in patients with and without diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer's code: 00506298

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's country: Spain

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-30 09:43

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-31 11:49

Review time: 1 Day and 2 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" 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 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

The presenta manuscript by Liana L, et al. a Systemic Review and Meta-analysis on the dual antiplatelet treatment of diabetes people with ischemic cardiovascular disease is very interesting from a clinical practice point of view. I recommend its publication in the WDJ.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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