

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 87339

**Title:** Reduced risk of dementia in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus using Chinese herbal medicine: A nested case-control study

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05688164

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Research Fellow

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Hungary

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-08-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-06 08:16

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-07 09:56

**Review time:** 1 Day and 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

7 August 2023 The review on the manuscript, titled "Association of use of Chinese herbal medicine with dementia risk among subjects with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a nested case-control study" by Liao HH et al., submitted to World Journal of Diabetes. Manuscript ID: 87339 Dear Authors, One of the current challenges is the lack of large-scale, well-designed clinical trials to evaluate the efficacy and safety of Chinese herbal medicine for patients with type 2 diabetes and its potential impact on dementia risk. In the present research article titled "Association of use of Chinese herbal medicine with dementia risk among subjects with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a nested case-control study," Liao and colleagues present a nested case-control study that investigates the association between the use of Chinese herbal medicine and the risk of dementia among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. The primary strength of this manuscript is that it provides valuable insights into the potential benefits and risks of using Chinese herbal medicine for patients with type 2 diabetes and its impact on dementia risk. The study allowed for a more efficient and cost-effective way of investigating the association between Chinese herbal medicine and dementia risk. The study also used rigorous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

criteria for selecting the participants and controlling for potential confounding factors, which enhances the validity and reliability of the findings. Additionally, the study provides important implications for healthcare providers and patients with diabetes who are considering using Chinese herbal medicine. In general, I think the idea of this article is really interesting, and the authors' fascinating observations on this timely topic may be of interest to the readers of World Journal of Diabetes. However, some comments, as well as some crucial evidence that should be included to support the authors' argumentation, needed to be addressed to improve the quality of the manuscript, its adequacy, and its readability prior to its publication in the present form. My overall opinion is to publish this research article after the authors have carefully considered my comments and suggestions below. Please consider the following comments: 1. Please present a concise and self-explanatory title conveying the most important findings of this study. Suggestion: "Reduced risk of dementia in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus using Chinese herbal medicine: a nested case-control study" [1 - 3]. 2. A graphical abstract that will visually summarize the main findings of the manuscript is highly recommended. 3. Abstract: I would like the authors to make as much effort for this section as for the rest of the manuscript. Please present the abstract in 200 words (preferably 200-220 words, max. 250) according to the guidelines of the journal [4], focusing on proportionally presenting the background, methods, results, and conclusion (without the headings of subsections). The background should include the general background (one to two sentences), the specific background (two to three sentences), and "the current issue addressed to this study" (one sentence), leading to the objectives. The methods should clarify the authors' approach, such as study design and variables, to solving the problem and/or making progress on the problem. The results should close with a single sentence putting the results in a more general context. The conclusion should open with one sentence describing the main result using such words

as “Here we show”, which should be followed by statements such as the potential and the advance this study has provided in the field, and finally a broader perspective (two to three sentences) readily comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline [5–8]. 4. Keywords: Please list as many keywords as allowed by the journal and choose them from Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) [9] and use as many as possible in the title and in the first two sentences of the abstract [7,8]. 5. Introduction: The authors need to fully expand this section with several paragraphs made up of about 1000 words, introducing information on the main constructs of this protocol, which should be understood by a reader in any discipline, and making it persuasive enough to put forward the main purpose of the current research the authors have conducted and the specific purpose the authors have intended by this protocol. I would like to encourage the authors to present the introduction starting with the general background, proceeding to the specific background, and finally the current issue addressed to this study, leading to the objectives. Those main structures should be organized in a logical and cohesive manner [10]. In this regard, the following works, but not limited to, may enhance the value of this manuscript [11–14]. 6. Methods: I recommend citing more references to ensure the reliability and integrity of the evidence in the study design the authors built and the methodology they have decided to apply. 7. Results: Please refrain from describing statistical values in the body of the text; tables should be used instead. I recommend the authors present figures in color. I suggest closing this section with a paragraph that puts the results into a more general context. 8. Discussion: The discussion section lacks a clear and structured organization. I would like the authors to begin this section with an introduction and then provide a summary of the previous section. Then, I expect the authors to develop arguments clarifying the potential of this study as an extension of the previous work, the implication of the findings, how this study could facilitate future research, the ultimate goal, the challenge, the knowledge and technology necessary to

achieve this goal, the statement about this field in general, and finally the importance of this line of research. It is particularly important to present its limits, its merits, and the potential translation of this study into clinical practice [15,16]. 9. Conclusion: I believe that presenting this section with 150–200 words would benefit from a single paragraph that presents some thoughtful and in-depth considerations by the authors as experts in order to convey the main message. The authors should make an effort to explain the theoretical implications as well as the translational application of their research. In order to understand the significance of this field, I believe it would be necessary to discuss theoretical and methodological avenues in need of refinement as well as future research directions. 10. References: Please cite more references. An original article like this typically cites 60–70 references. Overall, the manuscript contains two figures, three tables, and 39 references. I believe that the manuscript has merits in its rigorous methodology, which enhances the validity and reliability of the findings. The study used a nested case-control design, which allowed for a more efficient and cost-effective way of investigating the association between Chinese herbal medicine and dementia risk. The study also used strict criteria for selecting the participants and controlling for potential confounding factors. Additionally, the study provides valuable insights into the potential benefits and risks of using Chinese herbal medicine for patients with type 2 diabetes and its impact on dementia risk. The findings of this study have important implications for healthcare providers and patients with diabetes who are considering using Chinese herbal medicine. I hope that, after careful revisions, the manuscript can meet the journal's high standards for publication. I declare no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript. Best regards, Reviewer

References: 1.  
<https://plos.org/resource/how-to-write-a-great-title/> 2.  
<https://www.nature.com/nature-index/news-blog/how-to-write-a-good-research-science-academic-paper-title> 3.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

- <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/catchy-title> 4.
- <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204> 5.
- <https://www.scribbr.com/dissertation/abstract/> 6.
- <https://writing.wisc.edu/handbook/assignments/writing-an-abstract-for-your-research-paper/> 7. <https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.100159> 8.
- [https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA\\_685\\_18](https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_685_18) 9. <https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/> 10.
- <https://dept.writing.wisc.edu/wac/writing-an-introduction-for-a-scientific-paper/> 11.
- <https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines11071903> 12.
- <https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines9050517> 13.
- <https://doi.org/10.31083/j.fbl2703076> 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10091809> 15.
- <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.103.2.001> 16.
- <https://www.scribbr.com/dissertation/discussion/>

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 87339

**Title:** Reduced risk of dementia in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus using Chinese herbal medicine: A nested case-control study

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07248313

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Consultant Physician-Scientist, Professor, Researcher

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-08-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-11 04:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-21 06:15

**Review time:** 10 Days and 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



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

The review report of the manuscript entitled Association of use of Chinese herbal medicine with dementia risk among subjects with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a nested case-control study is as follows. 1 Title. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. It may be considered suitable. 2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. 3 Key Words. Key words may not match with the words used in the title of the manuscript. So, some other suitable key words may be provided. 4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. In addition, it may also include the prevalence of dementia in T2DM case in respect to age group. 5 Methods. The manuscript does not describe the methods in adequate detail. The following information may be provided in this section.

- Information regarding sample size determination is lacking.
- The definition of case: diagnostic criteria of type 2 diabetes mellitus and dementia.
- 20-70 years of age group subject were included, but the subjects were classified into two groups only i.e.  $\leq 50$  years and  $>50$  years.  $\leq 50$  years subjects may further be classified into different age groups to report the prevalence of dementia in





**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

T2DM patients. • When was this study conducted? • When the cases were included in this study and upto what duration the data regarding cases were followed retrospectively in the National Health Insurance database. • The statement 'All enrolled subjects were followed until the earliest dementia incident, death, withdrawal, or the end of this study, whichever came first'. The direction of follow up of the subjects in the cohort is not clear. In case of case control study, the direction of follow up (case to exposure) may be retrospective. • The time line in the given below sentences may be clarified to avoid confusion about the study. o The present study focused on subjects 20–70 years of age with T2DM who had at least three outpatient diagnoses or a single inpatient visit of 250 made by the doctors who specialized in endocrinology between 2001 and 2010. o The case of this study was defined as having the first diagnosis of dementia occurring during 2002–2013 • Assessment of CHM exposure: the term dose-response is not suitable. As the classification was based on duration of CHM exposure not on the dose. • The criteria for classifying of the subjects on income may be given. 6 Results. The outcomes of the study may be modified as suggested in the methods section. o Average time period for development of dementia in T2DM may also be reported. 7 Discussion. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately. the following key points need concise, clear and logical explanation. o Specifically,, for those who received CHM treatment for more than two years, the risk of dementia would be reduced by nearly 80%. o The integration of CHM would reduce the chance of dementia by nearly 50%. How are these conclusion drawn? 8 Illustrations and tables. The figures, diagrams, and tables are of sufficient good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and the legends are adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown 9 Biostatistics. The manuscript meets the requirements of biostatistics. 10 References. The manuscript appropriately cites the latest, important and authoritative references in the

Introduction and Discussion sections. 11 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. The style, language and grammar need improvement. 12 Ethics statements. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 87339

**Title:** Reduced risk of dementia in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus using Chinese herbal medicine: A nested case-control study

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05688164

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Research Fellow

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Hungary

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-08-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jing-Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-09-15 09:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-09-15 10:05

**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
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

15 September 2023 The 2nd review on the manuscript, titled “Association of use of Chinese herbal medicine with dementia risk among subjects with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a nested case-control study” by Liao HH et al., submitted to World Journal of Diabetes. Manuscript ID: 87339 Dear Authors, I am pleased to see that the authors have addressed the issues I raised in the previous round. Currently, the manuscript is a well-written research paper with informative layouts that present a nested case-control study that investigates the association between the use of Chinese herbal medicine and the risk of dementia among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. I believe the manuscript meets the journal’s high standards for publication. I am looking forward to seeing more papers written by the same authors. Thank you! I declare no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript. Best regards, Reviewer