

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82451

Title: Exercise therapy for sarcopenia and diabetes

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06490440

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Portugal

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-17 09:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-24 11:20

Review time: 7 Days and 2 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 manuscript reviews some studies that applied training to diabetic people with sarcopenia, proving how positive the practice of physical exercise is for improving health in elderly people with diabetes and sarcopenia. However, it does not present original findings or new study hypotheses that have not already been studied. This study presents a good quality synthesis of information regarding different types of exercise to be applied to the presented morbidities. The conclusions summarize the data that this study analyzed. The study focuses a lot on resistance training, and it would be interesting to analyze different types of training, such as strength and cardiovascular training, as the title itself indicates, in order to understand the differences and the best method to apply in the studied diseases. Regarding diabetes, there is still some research on different training, but in sarcopenia only the study of resistance training appears, it would be interesting to present the effects of the same types of training in the different diseases studied.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82451

Title: Exercise therapy for sarcopenia and diabetes

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: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-30 03:24

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-06 15:58

Review time: 7 Days and 12 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, • in line number 28, the words “which are” may be as “which is”; • in line number 29, “disorders as” as “disorders such as”; • in line number 71, “in strength” as “in the strength”; • in line number 91, “role by” as “role in”; • in line number 122, “were are” as “either were or are”; • in line number 173, “summarized of” as “summarized”; • in table, “effect of” as “effect on”; • in table, “than the” as “than in the”. 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, • in line number 29, the words “as decrease” may be as “as decreased”; • in line number 74, “specialties” as “specialities”; • in table, “exercise response.” as “exercise responses.”; • in table, “and decreases” as “and decreasing”; • in table, “bodyweight” as “body weight”; • in table, “Significant” as “The significant”. 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, glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c), 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. Additional keywords may be included and the keywords (since the authors used only four keywords) that are not in the title. The keywords should assist computer searches to find your specific article. 5. The introduction part appears less informative about the diabetes, thus this section should be indicated as detailed to understand the manuscript in clear. In particular, the authors are encouraged to include the prevalence data (recent) about diabetes. 6. In the end of introduction justify study rationale of the review, what new the review is going to explore and the question. And also the line numbers 40 and 41 should be reparsed since it micic the end of abstract (line numbers, 27 to 29). 7. The literature search should be described in detail. The authors are encouraged to include the database, search engines (like PubMed, ScienceDirect, Google scholar etc.), the keywords used etc., which may be included in the introduction section. 8. The limitation of the present investigation may be given along with conclusion or under separate heading for understanding the concepts clearly.