

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 24895

Title: Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists favorably address all components of metabolic syndrome

Reviewer's code: 00058872

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 14:46

Date reviewed: 2016-02-16 17:08

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 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

Authors are requested to quote the pertinent paper about the link between MS and NAFLD, i.e., World J Gastroenterol. 2013 Jun 14;19(22):3375-84. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v19.i22.3375. What about non-alcoholic fatty liver disease as a new criterion to define metabolic syndrome?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 24895

Title: Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists favorably address all components of metabolic syndrome

Reviewer's code: 01196818

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 14:46

Date reviewed: 2016-02-17 16:50

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 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 checked="" 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

This review article introduced the basis of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists (GLP-1RA) to use in metabolic syndrome (MetS). It is useful in the understanding of metabolic disorders. I like to give the following suggestions. 1. All products of GLP-1RA belonged to the peptide that cannot be applied through oral administration. This point was not mentioned in clear. 2. One table summarized all GLP-1RA with comparison of specificity in each disorder concerned in this article from hyperglycemia, blood pressure, to coronary heart disease. Additionally, is it obtained due to the activation of GLP-1R only? 3. Adverse effects of GLP-1RA were not conducted. What is the possible reason for each peptide to induce such side effect(s)? 4. Oral agonist for GLP-1R is expected but how to develop it? Please add one perspective. 5. Combination of GLP-1RA with others will be applied in clinics. Please take the reference(s) into this report. 6. What is the most reliable one of GLP-1AR at this moment? It can be included in the conclusion.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 24895

Title: Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists favorably address all components of metabolic syndrome

Reviewer's code: 00506397

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 14:46

Date reviewed: 2016-02-26 23:26

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 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

The authors have presented a review of the current literature pertaining to the use of GLP-1 receptor agonists. I do not have major criticism of this Manuscript except its organizational format. Two MINOR formatting issues must be fixed before it is ready to be published in the WJD as outlined below: 1. Authors should format the Manuscript so that every Reference that they describe is given a separate paragraph. For example, Introduction can be consolidated into THREE PARAGRAPHS 2. The Manuscript should be carefully edited so that the names of drugs are uniformly stated (either ALL of them begin with an Uppercase in their names or ALL of them in Lowercase). The last lined of the ABSTRACT should have a CONCLUDING statement statement. The last sentence of the Abstract should be incorporated earlier as an AIM of the Review.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 24895

Title: Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists favorably address all components of metabolic syndrome

Reviewer's code: 00506390

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 14:46

Date reviewed: 2016-03-28 17:08

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 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

Revisions:

General Comments:

1. The review has a very interesting and relevant topic, especially with the prevalence of MetS. The manuscript is generally well written with only a few issues that should be addressed to strengthen this review.
2. Please review for grammatical/punctuation errors. There were several punctuation issues throughout the review.
3. Please review for formatting issues. There were several formatting issues (i.e., spacing within sentences, spacing between paragraphs, etc.) throughout the manuscript and references.

Introduction:

1. Page 2: Para 4: The authors state “Recent figures in the USA....”, but refer to statistics from 2010. Please confirm these are the most current statistics. NHANES has data through 2012.
2. Page 2: Para 4: The authors reference the 2009 Joint Scientific Statement. Please provide a formal, in-text reference.
3. Page 4: Para 1: The authors state “reduction of 0.78% in the albiglutide group and 0.99% in the liraglutide group; treatment difference was 0.21%.” Please clarify the numbers used (i.e., does 0.78% mean 78% or 0.78% or 0 to 78%).
4. Page 6: Para 1: The authors state “increase in HDL-cholesterol (18% increment from baseline)”. Does “increment” refer to the type of increase observed? If so, please clarify why an incremental increase is significant.