

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58170

**Title:** Continuous glucose monitoring defined Time-in-Range is associated with Sudomotor dysfunction in Type 2 Diabetes

**Reviewer's code:** 03470109

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-27 15:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-27 17:16

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dr. Shao and colleagues have reported association between time-in-range by CGM with autonomic dysfunctions in patients with T2D. There has been a lot of interest in understanding association between CGM metrics and diabetes care and complications since A1c has many limitations and CGM use is increasing. Overall, manuscript is written well. My main concern is the retrospective nature of the study and use of only 72 hours of CGM data. I have detailed my assessment as follows. 1. As stated above, international consensus recommends use of at least 2 weeks of CGM data for research and clinical purpose as 2 weeks correlates well with A1c. Use of 72 hours of CGM data is too short duration and I am not sure that will convey meaningful results. 2. Diabetes complications depends on diabetes control and duration and therefore, this cross-sectional nature of study would not provide definitive conclusion. Rather, this is a hypothesis generating. Results of this study may not be generalizable. I suggest extracting last 5-10 years of A1c of these patients and reanalyze the data as I am sure average A1c would correlate with sudomotor functions. 3. Authors (last paragraph of discussion) mentioned that there are few limitations. However, these few limitations are major limitations and downplaying limitations would not help. I would suggest acknowledging these major limitations. 4. Also, this is a retrospective study and hospital based study therefore, unmeasured bias cannot be ruled out. 5. There was no priory hypothesis or sample size calculations provided. This may be due to unplanned cross-sectional study. 6. Sample size is large and p of 0.01 may be better than 0.05. 7. Please provide information on other diabetes microvascular complications in Table 1. 8. Table 2 can be moved as supplemental.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58170

**Title:** Continuous glucose monitoring defined Time-in-Range is associated with Sudomotor dysfunction in Type 2 Diabetes

**Reviewer's code:** 02951258

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-28 12:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-29 09:56

**Review time:** 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear authors, Thank you for your interesting manuscript submitted to WJD. This is a very comprehensive and well written paper. The whole structure and logic of this paper are quite good. The Materials and Methods section provides insufficient information. Information about other complications of diabetes mellitus, as well as treatment must be added. TBR among two groups was 0, so it raises the question about sugar lowering drugs used by patients. As duration of diabetes was 7 (2.11) in sudomotor dysfunction (-) and 10 (6.15) years in sudomotor dysfunction (+) group, it is clear that insulin was prescribed. Please add and check the information. CGM was performed for 72 hours, but it says that TIR, TBR, TAR are presented during 1 day period. Please confirm. Meanwhile, the detailed discussion is given. The authors introduce the study background clearly and the figures in the paper illustrate the study. Major suggestion: it is recommended by international consensus to use of at least 2 weeks of CGM data for research and clinical purpose as 2 weeks correlates well with HbA1c. Authors have used only 72 hours of CGM data, but it was stated as limitation of this study. It should clearly be written that it is a major limitation, so obtained results may not be generalizable and further studies are needed. In addition, the authors also referred to the latest research articles. There are some syntax errors and misspelling throughout the paper. Please check the paper carefully to exclude them. This manuscript is interesting and may be published after the correction.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58170

**Title:** Continuous glucose monitoring defined Time-in-Range is associated with Sudomotor dysfunction in Type 2 Diabetes

**Reviewer's code:** 02623966

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Attending Doctor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-30 17:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-30 17:03

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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



**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>**

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

According to my knowledge, it is a novel paper in its field opening new horizons for further evidence. In addition, the object as well as the results are appropriately discussed in the context of previous literature explaining the importance of the manuscript in its field. Authors succeed to present their data in a clear way adding information to the existing literature. Therefore, I have no corrections or further work to propose for the improvement of the manuscript and therefore it can be published unaltered.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58170

**Title:** Continuous glucose monitoring defined Time-in-Range is associated with Sudomotor dysfunction in Type 2 Diabetes

**Reviewer's code:** 02623966

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Attending Doctor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-08-28 15:16

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-08-28 15:17

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	[ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Grade A: Excellent [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade B: Very good [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade C: Good [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade D: Fair [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	[ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	[ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Accept (High priority) [ <input type="radio"/> ] Accept (General priority) [ <input type="radio"/> ] Minor revision [ <input type="radio"/> ] Major revision [ <input type="radio"/> ] Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting manuscript. Authors succeed to present their data in a clear way adding information to the existing literature. Therefore, I have no corrections to do and the manuscript can be published unaltered.