

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82096

Title: Diabetes and cognitive function: An evidence-based current perspective

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05322345

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-05 20:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-06 19:09

Review time: 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

This invited study entitled “Diabetes and Cognitive Function: An Evidence-based Current Perspective” seems to have been generally well executed and written. Furthermore, I believe that this work will be of great interest to the readers. Finally, I have only two remarks to further improve the quality of the paper. Short title It is too long. (e.g., Diabetes and Cognitive Function) Methodology Although, this paper is review, and not a systematic review (I presume a narrative review), in my opinion, a short section named Methodology should be included in the article. It should contain the type of review, which databases where searched, in which time period, was there any language restriction, by which authors, and which author approved the final list of included studies.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82096

Title: Diabetes and cognitive function: An evidence-based current perspective

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05817430

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-06 04:49

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-09 10:23

Review time: 3 Days and 5 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 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 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 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

In the present scientific paper, the authors introduce the “Diabetes and Cognitive Function: An Evidence-based Current Perspective”. In detail, the paper is good, but I have some concerns about the article which are listed as follows:

- o There are some minor grammatical errors in the text. Please control the text in that manner.
- o Please modify the abstract format (A concise and factual abstract is required).
- o The important point is that to improve the manuscript (novelty), the authors should at least try to do an extensive discussion/critical comparison of the clinical trials (results) with previous reports. Therefore, the authors should represent the clinical trials (investigations) and proper related tables.