PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 53937

Title: Evaluation of oxidative stress levels in obesity and diabetes by the free oxygen radical test and free oxygen radical defence assays and correlations with anthropometric and laboratory parameters

Reviewer's code: 00227633

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Author's country: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-01 17:34

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-02 17:16

Review time: 23 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS

[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing		[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good		[ ] Accept (General priority)	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing		Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Advanced
		[Y] Major revision	[Y] General
		[ ] Rejection	[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author's purpose of the investigation stress, obesity and diabetes is very interesting, also for medical and/or scientists from related research fields. I would recommend the suggestions described below: 1) The title should be short and concise. According to recent studies that would favor future citations to the paper. What is really new in the paper? The stress and obesity?? The FORD and/or FORT analysis? its correlation? 2) Abstract should be as quantitative as possible for rapid comparison with similar studies. Avoid imprecise terms such as significantly. On the other hand, if the effect is not statistically significant no need to mention it because it could be only a tendency not a fact. 3) Globally, the results are not properly described. The authors should first describe in a quantitative manner the data before jump to conclusions. Avoid imprecise and/or qualitative terms such as for example significantly lower or higher…but how much?   4) A figure for the correlations for FORD and/or FORT should be inserted. I think that what is new are these correlations and it is not enough analysis just by the Table. A better understanding of these data is obtained by the inclusion with these graphics. 5) Discussion should be more assertive and concise and eventually be divided in sections with titles highlighting the major results. Can the data obtained in the present study be compare with similar studies performed in other countries? Comparison is a step

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

forward and should be inserted   6) In conclusion section, partial conclusions first and then global conclusions would also favor the take home message of the paper. Still, in this section it not clear what is new in the paper. Once again, imprecise terms such as significantly elevated (but how much?), should be avoided. Moreover, a take home message could eventually be inserted in the end of the conclusions.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 53937

Title: Evaluation of oxidative stress levels in obesity and diabetes by the free oxygen radical test and free oxygen radical defence assays and correlations with anthropometric and laboratory parameters

Reviewer's code: 00503221

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Director, Professor

Reviewer's country: Israel

Author's country: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-02 17:56

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-03 07:55

Review time: 13 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS

[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[ ] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good			[Y] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Urinary parameters such as albumin/Cretinine ratio is missing for all participants/ its important parameter 2/EGFR calculation 3. Urinary metabolites of Oxidative stress biomarkers?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 53937

Title: Evaluation of oxidative stress levels in obesity and diabetes by the free oxygen radical test and free oxygen radical defence assays and correlations with anthropometric and laboratory parameters

Reviewer's code: 00227633

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Author's country: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-01

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Qiao Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-20 12:30

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-20 12:41

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS

[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good			[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[ ] General
			[Y] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors were very positive regarding the reviewers comments. Globally the paper was clearly improved. Thanks.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No