

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 62661

Title: Oral Glucose Tolerance Test in Diabetes, the old method revisiting.

Reviewer's code: 02622894

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-15 07:58

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-22 02:31

Review time: 6 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Authors reported the role and perspectives of OGTT in clinical practice and basic research. 1) Line 105-107: recent articles were suggested using the 1hPG for identification of high risk individual before β cell function was impaired. Thus, the sentence of "individual with reduced β cell function should be considered for adoption into clinical practice" was not agree with recent suggestions. Thus, it would be nice to mention in detail the advantages and purpose of 1hPG and 30min PG. 2) Line 142-143: the 3rd paragraph of the "OGTT through quantitative analysis" was taken from author's previous report. The line 142-143 did not contain the content of "due to the formation of negative value(s)", so the meaning of the sentence cannot be understood. 3) In the "OGTT In Basic Research" section, the same abbreviations was mentioned again (IR, IGT, and AUC), and the same reference was mentioned another number (The reference 8th was same to the 29th reference) 4) The overall contents are less different from the previously reported review articles, but "OGTT in perspectives" is interesting topic. Recently, diabetes prediction model using OGTT with or without other metabolic risk factors have been reported in many journals. So, it would be interesting to summarize these papers.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 62661

Title: Oral Glucose Tolerance Test in Diabetes, the old method revisiting.

Reviewer's code: 05086539

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Senior Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-14

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-17 22:29

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-27 11:27

Review time: 9 Days and 12 Hours

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

1. This manuscript's type was unclear between review or perspective. 2. No Data supported the conclusion

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 62661

Title: Oral Glucose Tolerance Test in Diabetes, the old method revisiting.

Reviewer's code: 03847081

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree:

Professional title:

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Serbia

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-14

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-16 10:33

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-30 05:27

Review time: 13 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input 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

Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review

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? YES

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? YES

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? N/A

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? YES

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 manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. Also, the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner, the discussion is accurate and discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently.

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? The table is sufficient, has a good quality and is appropriately illustrative for the paper contents and does not require additional corrections.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? N/A

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 manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections without self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references. 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? The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized with accurate and appropriate language and grammar. 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? N/A 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? N/A. The manuscript, "Oral Glucose Tolerance Test in Diabetes, the old method revisiting," by Kuo et al. investigates contemporary and traditional use of OGTT in clinical practice and basic studies with its limitations and variations between bench and bedside application. The manuscript is well written and addresses important questions. However, this reviewer has some minor suggestions: Introduction 1. Please, add also a few sentences about increased diabetes-related morbidity and mortality, especially in young patients, and economic burden of type 2 diabetes mellitus 2. "Therefore, identification of IGT is important for T2DM prevention

strategies on those who are at high risk". - "on" should be changed to "in" 3. "Although animals may be useful to study the basis of human disease, clear differences do exist between species regarding to the metabolic regulation" - please, rephrase this sentence as follows "Although animals may be useful to study the basis of human disease, there are clear differences between species regarding the metabolic regulation" 4. "Therefore, limitation(s) of OGTT in basic research has been conducted" - please, rephrase this sentence (e.g. "Therefore, results obtained in these studies are partially relevant in clinical practice and even six potential limitations of OGTT in basic research have been highlighted.") 5. "The OGTT has applied over the last century using the plasma glucose concentrations, measured either after an overnight fast or glucose loading, have been the useful tool for diagnosing IGT." - please, rephrase this sentence as follows "The OGTT has been applied over the last century using the plasma glucose concentrations, measured either after an overnight fast or glucose loading, as a useful tool for diagnosing IGT." 6. Please, rephrase the aim of the study. OGTT in clinical practice 7. Another review article summarized the clinical reports to suggest that a 1-h PG level \geq 8.6 mmol/L (or 155 mg/dL) individuals with reduced β -cell function which should be considered for adoption into clinical practice [17]. - Please, clarify this sentence better. 8. "-monophasic" - please, add a space between "-" and "monophasic" 9. Page 4 - "On the other word" should be changed to "In other words" 10. Page 4 - "pharamcokinetical field" should be changed to "pharmacokinetic field" 11. "The application of sophisticated mathematical and statistical methods such as machine learning algorithms has been developed to extract the features from OGTT glucose curves in predicting diabetes." The application of" is superfluous in the sentence. Please, delete and rephrase the sentence as follows: "Sophisticated mathematical and statistical methods such as machine learning algorithms have been developed to extract the features from OGTT glucose curves in predicting diabetes" OGTT in basic research 12. "focusing" should be

changed to “focused” 13. “OGTT did not use for diagnosis in basic research” should be changed to “OGTT was not used for diagnosis in basic research” 14. “.....of glucose-insulin index obtaining from...” should be changed to “of glucose-insulin index obtained from...” 15. “Results in OGTT shown...” should be changed to “Results in OGTT showed...” 16. “may influence by agent” should be change to “can be affected by” 17. “...reports including the samples show a critical reduction...” should be changed to “...reports including the samples that show a critical reduction...” 18. “However, quantification of insulin change is less to conduct probably it is not applied in clinical practice” – please, rewrite this sentence, it is not clear. 19. “Before now, a 2-h 75 g OGTT is widely applied in clinical practice and it has also been followed to apply in basic research except the loaded glucose amount was modified. However, what is the next in basic research once the OGTT is revised to 30-min or 1-hPG in clinical practice which is an important subject for basic research in the future.” - Please, clarify these sentences better. OGTT in perspectives 20. “....as criteria clinical practice” should be changed to ““....as criteria in clinical practice” 21. “remained to find” should be changed to “remain to be found” 22. “...(GIP),” – please, delete the comma 23. “However, the peak and decay in...” – please change “decay” to “decline” 24. “The support vector machine (SVM) along with a rule-based explanation has been documented [40] to consistent with the machine learning algorithms to extract features from OGTT in predicting diabetes” please, rewrite this sentence, it is not clear. Conclusion 1. “widely suggested to be shorten as” – “as” should be changed to “to” 2. “...in recent” – The sentence is not complete. Did you mean “in recent years”? 3. “this tool at different aims” – please, change “at” to “with” 4. Please, add in “Conclusion” some specific messages to clinicians. 5. “Shorten of the duration in OGTT is suitable for animals or not that remained unknown” - please, rewrite this sentence, it is not clear. 6. “Collectively” should be changed to “Altogether” or “Finally”



**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