

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57872

**Title:** Comparison of clinical features and outcomes in peritoneal dialysis-associated peritonitis patients with and without diabetes: a multicenter retrospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 00058696

**Position:** Editor-in-Chief

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-27 19:39

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-02 13:19

**Review time:** 4 Days and 17 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I have carefully read this new retrospective clinical research study. My major questions are summarized below: 1) I would remove abbreviations from the Core Tip. 2) Based on their Introduction, what is the authors' hypothesis? 3) Potential reasons for differences in the types of bacteria being cultured are not insightful. "Impaired vision" is not a sufficient potential origin. Please consider: i.) bacterial colonization in individuals undergoing peritoneal dialysis with and without diabetes mellitus; and ii.) the potential role of control of patients' diabetes; there are studies of impairment of neutrophil oxidative burst in individuals with elevated blood levels of glycosylated hemoglobin and/or blood glucose. 4) With regards to "nutritional status of patients" (in authors' Discussion), the difference in blood albumin levels summarized in Table 1 and in Table 3 are not likely to be of clinical significance. Blood albumin is a better marker of an ongoing inflammatory response. There are published scoring criteria for a diagnosis of protein malnutrition (Harvinder GS, et al. Dialysis Malnutrition and Malnutrition Inflammation Scores: screening tools for prediction of dialysis-related protein-energy wasting in Malaysia. *Asia Pac J Clin Nutr.* 2016; 25(1):26-33).

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57872

**Title:** Comparison of clinical features and outcomes in peritoneal dialysis-associated peritonitis patients with and without diabetes: a multicenter retrospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 00058696

**Position:** Editor-in-Chief

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ji-Hong Liu (Technical Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-08-12 12:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-08-12 18:39

**Review time:** 6 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Do the authors have a hypothesis? A hypothesis should be stated in their introduction; the results of their study, in reference to the authors' hypothesis, should be mentioned in their Discussion.