

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 72558

**Title:** Comments on “Effect of type 2 diabetes mellitus in the prognosis of acute-on-chronic liver failure patients in China”

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04761604

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DNB, MBBS

**Professional title:** Doctor, Teacher

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-10-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-10-21 02:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-10-21 03:05

**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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<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>

<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**

The critique doesn't appear intelligible. The comments authors made are relevant when made pre-publication. The abbreviations used in the letter are not up to the required standard.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 72558

**Title:** Comments on “Effect of type 2 diabetes mellitus in the prognosis of acute-on-chronic liver failure patients in China”

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05294352

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBBS

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-10-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-10-20 12:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-10-28 18:38

**Review time:** 8 Days and 6 Hours

<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 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

I read the letter with interest. I applaud the authors' effort in highlighting the important points that have not been discussed in the original manuscript because these points are crucial for conclusion and further interpretation. I have a few suggestions that could improve the overall manuscript. Comments related to the checklist mentioned: 1- The title reflects the whole theme discussed in the manuscript. 2-Abstract can be improved a bit. I would suggest that the authors be more specific in pointing out the most important points that should have been highlighted in the main study. As of now, the abstract seems a bit too general for the theme being discussed. 3-Keywords seem appropriate. I would suggest adding one more keyword based off the most important factor that was missed in the original manuscript used for writeup of the letter. 4-Background and Methods seem adequate. 5-The points that have been pointed out can be improved. Expand on the idea of 'age and time scope' as mentioned in the 2nd paragraph. In the 3rd paragraph, specifically mention the parameters that are most important and have been missed in the multivariate analysis. Other points that could be mentioned for Materials and Methods section include calculation of population size because a sample of 200 for a study period of 7 years is less. I would suggest adding one to two lines roping together all the information discussed as a conclusion. 6- Number of references is inadequate. The point about ALB can be elaborated upon and further explained with the help of references. The same can be said for risk factors that have just been superficially mentioned in 3rd paragraph. Another reference can be added for loss to follow-up. Kindly follow the format of the journal in referencing. A few things (PMID etc) are missing. 7- Minor improvements in sentence structure are needed because the

language at certain points seems a bit informal. For example, in paragraph 2 "Then, the author could determine the age scope of the conclusion", "We do not know how long the patient lived" and paragraph 3, "We do not know how long the patients were followed up, nor how the author defines the concept of follow-up". These sentences can be improved. Paragraphs 5 and 6 can be merged to one because both the paragraphs mention the following theme "the study mentions lung infection, urinary system infection, blood infection, and gallbladder infection with p-values that were close to 0.05". The last paragraph about results should be moved to just after "Materials and Methods". The conclusion is a bit wordy and can be made more concise. 8- Can the authors' suggest some form of hypothesis that can be worked on in the future as a part of the conclusion? Perhaps, adding a one-liner as a recommendation/suggestion. I believe that the letter has highlighted important areas for retrospective studies that should be definitely considered. Although this might not be novel yet emphasis on proper technique is always needed for improvement. In the future, researchers can benefit from this paper by not only taking into account the crucial requirements but also working on hypotheses suggested by the authors. Thank you for the opportunity to review this important article. Best of luck!