

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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 89620

**Title:** Exploring the Regulatory Role of miRNAs in Diabetes and the AGE/RAGE Axis:

A Comprehensive Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03656570

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Director, Manager, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-07

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-08 08:00

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-08 08:44

Review time: 1 Hour

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	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	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

1



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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No scientific significance</li> </ul>
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-Manuscript is well written, still a simple narrative review. - references are not old with many new citations. - The discussion was not deep enough, and some of the content of the discussion section should have appeared as results.