PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82002

Title: Effectiveness and Safety of Traditional Chinese Medicine Decoction for Diabetic Gastroparesis: A Network Meta-Analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03727433

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MHSc, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-09 08:33

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-09 08:41

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

(Put inserts in a different color font to identify changes in the article) Include in article 1 - Compare and contrast your study with others in the most relevant world literature, particularly the recent literature. 2 - What new information is sufficient to modify existing clinical practice? 3 - What are the conclusions and implications for current practice, and particularly for future research that may have a significant impact on clinical decisions? 4 - What does this study add to the literature? 5 - At the end of the Discussion, under the subheading "Limitations," review the limitations of your study.   6 - At the end of the limitations, under the subheading " Future directions". 7 - Conclusion Take special care to draw your conclusions only from your results and verify that your conclusions are firmly supported by your data 8– References Update 9 - I would recommend to add also GRADE approach and Include the other parameters of the network meta-analysis. 10 - Supplementary material A -Include the database used to perform the analysis B -Include the algorithms and scripts used in the software to perform the statistical analysis.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have provided a network meta-analysis of effectiveness and safety of traditional Chinese medicine decoction for diabetic gastroparesis. The paper is well structured and written using appropriate methodology. Limitations of the study are outlined. Only minor corrections are needed as follows. INTRODUCTION second sentence The International Diabetes Federation (IDF) estimates that approximately 537 million adult people worldwide will be were living with diabetes in 2021[3] penultimate sentence To provide a reference for the clinical selection of appropriate drugs drugs suitable for the treatment of DGP and to compare the efficacy and safety of various TCM decoctions in the treatment of DGP, this study reviewed recent randomized controlled trials (RCTs) to compare the efficacy of TCM decoctions.