

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28589

**Title:** Integrating insulin-like growth factor 1 and sex hormones into neuroprotection: Implications for diabetes

**Reviewer's code:** 03365000

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-12 18:33

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-10 13:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, I appreciate the editor for giving me the opportunity to review this paper. This review summarizes the broad number of published papers. Therefore, much information are contained in this manuscript and this might hamper the readers to understand. If possible, tables and precise figures that briefly summarizes each section should be added.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28589

**Title:** Integrating insulin-like growth factor 1 and sex hormones into neuroprotection: Implications for diabetes

**Reviewer's code:** 02563506

**Reviewer's country:** Sweden

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-12 18:33

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-10 13:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review article provides an updated account of the benefits of antidiabetic treatment to patients with ischemic stroke. The point of view is interesting and although the findings need to be further evaluated in clinical trials, I am positive for publication of this manuscript.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28589

**Title:** Integrating insulin-like growth factor 1 and sex hormones into neuroprotection: Implications for diabetes

**Reviewer's code:** 02764200

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-12 18:33

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-11 10:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nowadays, neuroprotection is a hot issue in glaucoma. So this manuscript is interesting in that it deals with clinical data on the efficacy of neuroprotective agents. However, in my opinion, this manuscript should be revised in some aspect. 1. Please revise this manuscript with English native speakers. It has many grammatically incorrect expressions. 2. Please avoid the use of abbreviations when the word is used for the first time in the manuscript