

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 26117

Title: Evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 01992073

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 16:28

Date reviewed: 2016-04-08 18:38

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"/> 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 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

The present paper is a well written review providing insight into one of the major problems that endanger a successful management of diabetes and its complications. Overall, I find this an interesting article, scientifically accurate, which conveys a clear-cut message and highlights the weak spots of defining the diagnostic threshold for diabetes and prediabetes. Interesting data on the important drawbacks of the HbA1c as a diagnostic criterion are also summarized, which might be of interest to the intended readers. I have no major comments on this well presented review, although in my opinion, the manuscript would substantially benefit from additional tables summarizing the studies analyzed (i.e. on HbA1c). Acronyms need to be consistently reported throughout the text. Manuscript should be carefully checked for typos and minor inconsistencies (i.e., criteria in running title). Authors, please, check references for correctness (see #12, #35).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 26117

Title: Evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 01408945

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 16:28

Date reviewed: 2016-04-07 09:47

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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript Number: 26117 Manuscript Title: The evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus Corresponding Author: Dr. Ritech Kumar et al. The reviewer's critiques are as follows. Major criticism: 1. References in this review article are biased. Authors should cite more reliable articles. 2. More important issue remains. Authors should demonstrate the relationship between macrovascular diseases and HbA1c. 3. In the 2nd paragraph of ADA criteria [1997] & WHO criteria [1999] section, authors described "FPG from 140 to 7.0 mmol/L". Is the Unit of 140 is mg/dl?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 26117

Title: Evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 02459617

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 16:28

Date reviewed: 2016-04-11 15:24

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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Ritesh et al. reviewed and summarized the scientific evidence supporting the justification of the differing criteria from the World Health Organization [WHO] and the American Diabetes Association [ADA]. This is an interesting article. However, minor language polishing is needed. Moreover, this manuscript should be carefully checked for typos.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 26117

Title: Evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 00504156

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 16:28

Date reviewed: 2016-04-13 04:53

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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is suitable for publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 26117

Title: Evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 01404215

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 16:28

Date reviewed: 2016-04-18 20:16

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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Kumar et al. is a comprehensive review study of the relationship between the diagnostic criteria between type 2 diabetes and plasma glucose levels throughout the XX Century. Major points 1. The text of the manuscript is too lengthy and wordy. A reduction between 10-15% would improve the perusal by the readers. 2. The text should be supplemented with an appropriate list of abbreviations to facilitate the meaning of the paragraphs. Along the text of the review appear up to 15 abbreviations, which make hard the reading without an appropriate list of abbreviations. 3. The authors should pay much attention to correct the appropriate separation of sentences after a colon in the paragraph. 4. There are some typographic mistakes along the text. In particular, the 140 value on page 7, line 10 should be corrected. 5. The organization of Table 1 is confusing. It should be edited again, better in a horizontal style.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 26117

Title: Evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 02446514

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 16:28

Date reviewed: 2016-04-19 01:13

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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments on the manuscript : "The evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus", by Kumar R, et al. In this manuscript, the authors showed the criteria for diabetes mellitus diagnostic along the time, as well as the evidence that support their establishment. The authors proposed a review of such evidences, mainly base on the definition of prediabetes state and their association with different complications. Although the text is interesting, I think that the first 9 pages could be significantly reduced, showing the conclusions of such evidences and pointing out the difficulties. In the Abstract, last sentence may be rephrased since the uniformity of criteria for diagnosis exist (blood glucose and HbA levels), then the main problem, as the authors mentioned in the discussion, is the identification of prediabetes. Also in conclusions, since the values of the actual criteria for prediabetes overlap with those of non-diabetic patients (normoglycemic), result of great relevance the use of new criteria that allow to identified people with high risk to develop diabetes and then the complications associated (prediabetes). Do the authors could propose something? Minor comments: Page 4, paragraph 2, last sentence is some how confuse. Page 5, last paragraph: well conducted studies...., suggest that the others were not well done? Page 6, line 4-5, is confuse to me.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

Page 7, line 3, please indicate the Nation; also, on which bases these patients were diabetic diagnosed? Page 7, paragraph 2, 1st line, is not clear to me what does "FPG from 140 to 7 mmol/l" means? Page 11, 1st paragraph, and last sentence in the page, indicate the references of the studies. Page 13, last line should be eliminated. Page 17, last paragraph indicate reference of the NHANES study. Page 19, end of paragraph 3, which are the units of the values presented ? % ?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 26117

Title: Evidence for current diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 02625203

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 16:28

Date reviewed: 2016-04-26 01:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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

This is a comprehensive review. I have no specific recommendations concerning the content. I would recommend editing of the English language.