# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 84990

**Title:** Effects of paricalcitol combined with hemodiafiltration on bone-metabolism-related indexes in patients with diabetic nephropathy and chronic renal failure

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06521107

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-06 03:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-11 00:37

**Review time:** 4 Days and 21 Hours

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [ ] Grade A: Excellent    [ Y] Grade B: Very good    [ ] Grade C: Good<br>[ ] Grade D: Fair    [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Novelty of this manuscript** | [ ] Grade A: Excellent    [ Y] Grade B: Good    [ ] Grade C: Fair<br>[ ] Grade D: No novelty |

| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [ Y] Grade B: Good   [  ] Grade C: Fair   [  ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |
|---|---|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [ Y] Grade B: Good   [  ] Grade C: Fair   [  ] Grade D: No scientific significance |
| 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 | [  ] Yes   [ Y] No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous   [  ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [  ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for asking me to review this manuscript by Ma XY et al. This is a retrospective study to investigate the effects of paricalcitol combined with hemodiafiltration on bone-metabolism-related indexes in patients with DN and CRF, and to construct an efficacy prediction model. The result of the study is of interest and may provide a basis for clinical treatment of comorbid DN and CRF. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology. The number of participants in the study is large enough. Furthermore, minor comment that I would to proposed: 1. Title: Proper and cover all the core result from the study. 2. Abstract: Address all the important component from the study. 3. Key words: could cover this study. 4. Introduction: Describe the overall basic knowledge for this study. Moreover, the aim of the study is clear. 5. Method: The present study is methodologically well conducted. 6. Results: The result of this study is of interest. 7. Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the

finding adequately and appropriately. 8. Illustrations and tables: I congratulate the authors for the captions to the tables very explicative and complete. However, calculation of Total effective rate of the Dialysis group in Table 2 is wrong and should be 33 after calculation. In addition, I recommend that the number and incidence of each group be presented in the Total effective rate, for example, Dialysis group should be 33/45 = 73.3%, and the Joint group should be 45/49 = 91.8%. Similarly, the same calculations are required for Total incidence rate in Table 3.

| Scientific quality | [  ] Grade A: Excellent    [  ] Grade B: Very good    [ Y] Grade C: Good |
| --- | --- |
|  | [  ] Grade D: Fair    [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | [  ] Grade A: Excellent    [ Y] Grade B: Good    [  ] Grade C: Fair |
|  | [  ] Grade D: No novelty |

| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | [   ] Grade A: Excellent    [ Y] Grade B: Good    [   ] Grade C: Fair<br>[   ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |
|---|---|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [   ] Grade A: Excellent    [ Y] Grade B: Good    [   ] Grade C: Fair<br>[   ] Grade D: No scientific significance |
| 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)<br>[ 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

In this study, the clinical efficacy and renal function improvement of the joint group were significantly higher than those in the dialysis group after treatment. The results suggest that paricalcitol combined with hemodiafiltration can deliver significantly greater efficacy in patients with comorbid DN and CRF, and improve renal function. The results indicate that paricalcitol combined with hemodiafiltration can control serum phosphorus and calcium levels, lower iPTH level, and improve bone-metabolism-related indexes, without increasing safety risks. Authors also established a risk model to predict the efficacy based on laboratory indexes. And their result indicates that this is an ideal predictive model. Some concerns have been noted including: #1 Table 2 and 3 are problematic and the current statistics of Total effective rate and Total incidence rate are not incidence rates. #2 Regarding adverse reactions, the text suggests to specifically describe the common adverse reactions in the two groups. #3 There are a few

grammatical errors, such as the discussion section "This indicates that that this is an ideal predictive model." One that needs to be deleted. So proofreading is needed to maintain the best sense of reading.