

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 80572

Title: Correlation between COVID-19 vaccination and diabetes mellitus: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05824612

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD, PsyD

Professional title: Reader in Health Technology Assessment, Research Assistant, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate, Research Fellow, Research Scientist, Researcher, Science Editor, Statistician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-04 08:49

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-04 09:23

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please review after revisions.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 80572

Title: Correlation between COVID-19 vaccination and diabetes mellitus: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05393454

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-23

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-21 08:27

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-23 12:07

Review time: 2 Days and 3 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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

1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words “of COVID-19” may be as “of the COVID-19”; “to hepatitis B” as “to the hepatitis B”; “Type of” as “The type of”; “Population aged” as “Population is aged”; “all the time” as “all time”; “vaccination were” as “vaccination was”; “Longitudinal” as “A longitudinal”; “DM associated” as “DM is associated”; “21 to 27 day interval” as “21 to 27-day or 21 to 27 days intervals”; “was significant” as “was a significant”; “, the” as “, and the”; “Temporary” as “A temporary”; “T1DM attributable” as “T1DM is attributable”; “First” as “The first”; “acute” as “an acute”; “adenovirus-vectored” as “the adenovirus-vectored”; “immune response” as “the immune response”; “vaccination were” as “vaccination was”; “of vaccine” as “of the vaccine”; “without comorbid” as “without the comorbid”; “than SARS-CoV-2-navie” as “than SARS-CoV-2-navie”; “than younger” as “than their younger”; “Use of” as “The use of”; “Pfizer-Biotech” as “the Pfizer-Biotech”; “diabetes were” as “diabetes was”; “of ChAdOx1nCoV-19” as “of the ChAdOx1nCoV-19”; “cellular” as “the cellular”; “mellitus associated” as “mellitus is associated”; “Study” as “The study”; “was significant” as

“was a significant”; “comparison of” as “comparison between”; “. More” as “. For more”; “to third” as “to the third”; “with Pfizer” as “with the Pfizer”; “AstraZeneca” as “the AstraZeneca”; “median” as “a median”; “following COVID-19” as “following the COVID-19”; “hyperglycemic” as “a hyperglycemic”; “and adenoviral” as “and the adenoviral”; “adjuvant,” as “an adjuvant,”; “dysfunction” as “the dysfunction”; “and have” as “and”; “to COVID-19” as “to the COVID-19”; “far. The SARS-CoV-2” as “far. SARS-CoV-2”; “, severity” as “, the severity”; “in immune” as “in the immune”; “new-onset” as “the new-onset”. The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words “COVID- 19” may be as “COVID-19”; “between after” as “between, after or after”; “pre-diabetes” as “pre-diabetes”; “a comorbidity” as “comorbidity”; “normal weight” as “normal-weight”; “Side effect,” as “Side effects,”; “positivity ,” as “positivity,”; “non-diabetic” as “nondiabetic”; “health care” as “healthcare”; “1 month” as “1-month”; “workers, but” as “workers but”; “vccination” as “vaccination”; “DISSCUSSION” as “DISCUSSION”; “flow, or” as “flow or”; “well regulated” as “well-regulated”; “studies it” as “studies, it”. The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the abstract and the remaining for the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, Diabetes mellitus (DM), type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), ACE2, etc.,). Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words to be abbreviated. 4. The introduction part appears less informative about the diabetes mellitus and its subsequent health consequences, thus this section should be indicated as detailed to understand the manuscript in clear. 5. The initial cited with reference in the text should be removed and should be in the author instruction of the journal (For example, reference “Lee HJ et

al[63]”) and it should also be checked all over the manuscript. 6. The conclusion seems very simple. All conclusions must be convincing statements on what was found to be novel, impact based on the strong support of the data/results/discussion. Moreover, the authors may also be included the limitation of the present findings for a better understanding of the manuscript.