

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53333

**Title:** Screening and lifestyle intervention studies of type 2 diabetes in rural residents

**Reviewer's code:** 02810791

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Research Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Author's country:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-01-16 12:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-01-30 10:04

**Review time:** 13 Days and 21 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 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 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

Wang and collaborators provide an important study that strives to curb the negative effects of diabetes by a lifestyle intervention. The results reported apply to real-life situations, and expansion of the proposed measures to a larger population may positively contribute to reduce the incidence of type 2 diabetes and its complications. 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Overall, the abstract summarizes satisfactorily the main findings of the study. Relatively to the abstract, I have the following comments. a) T2DM (or DM) should be defined. At any instance, the authors should use either T2DM or DM throughout the manuscript. b) "trace blood glucose" : simply state « blood glucose ». 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Keywords are missing in the main manuscript file and should be added. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? The background/introduction section of the manuscript clearly introduces the scientific / medical problem addressed in the study. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? The methods are presented in a very good detail. The execution strategy of the study is clear top the reader as well as the statistical analysis. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? The results are clearly presented 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? The discussion section is clear and integrates the relevant body of previous scientific literature. 8 Illustrations and tables.

Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Figure number 1 presents a problem as the x-axis is labeled in Chinese language. Overall, figure 1 should/could be removed as it simply presents the compliance rate for each intervention group. This information is redundant as it is already presented into the abstract.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? I believe that the statistical analysis is appropriate. In this respect, data in table 1 clearly show that after the intervention blood pressure, glycaemia and glycated albumin are decreasing. It appears that also body weight and waist circumference decrease (in a statistically significant way) but actually the magnitude of the decrease is minimal. Perhaps the use of a paired-test explain the significance. I suggest, however, that the authors present the primary data in a supplementary file so that the reader may appreciate the existence of significant differences even if the absolute magnitude of body mass decrease and waist circumference decrease is minimal. A second major problem that should be addressed by the authors is the fact that the data in the table are pooling the 4 interventional conditions. It is clear that the reader would like to see the results from each one of the 4 interventional protocols.

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? YES

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? The references presented in the manuscript are appropriate.

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? I strongly suggest that the manuscript is reviewed/edited by a native English speaker to greatly improve the linguistic presentation.

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their

manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? I think the author submitted all the relevant paperwork that justifies and endorses the execution of this small scale interventional trial. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? In my opinion, yes. I should not, however, that I do not have a full knowledge on the regulatory requirements applied in china for the execution of clinical/ interventional studies. Final remark: some of the attached forms in the submission are in Chinese language, which I cannot assess. My review is mainly based on the scientific content of the main manuscript, and I let the editorial staff evaluate the appropriateness of the attached regulatory documents.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ 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>**

*BPG Search:*

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

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53333

**Title:** Effects of lifestyle interventions on rural patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus

**Reviewer's code:** 02810791

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Research Assistant Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-31

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-26 14:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-26 15:07

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 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 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 no further commentaries to raise.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

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

### *BPG Search:*

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