

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 20430

Title: Simple calculator to estimate the medical cost of diabetes in sub-Saharan Africa

Reviewer's code: 00506276

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-06 20:07

Date reviewed: 2015-06-14 18:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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"/> No	<input 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

The interesting well-written paper. I have no critical comments.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 20430

Title: Simple calculator to estimate the medical cost of diabetes in sub-Saharan Africa

Reviewer's code: 00506239

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-06 20:07

Date reviewed: 2015-06-07 18:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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 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 authors describe a tool that is a simple medical cost calculator; they report and discuss the results of this tool. The manuscript is well written and well organized. However, I have some comments for the Authors. - Introduction: it is too long and should be shortened: e g. the first para contains well known information and it can be deleted. - Table 2 is really too full with many details: I suggest to condense it, underlying only the main data. - Discussion: the authors should compare their results with previous data from literature and comment the main differences in order to show the novelty of this research. - Conclusion: again, the authors should underline the new aspects of their study.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 20430

Title: Simple calculator to estimate the medical cost of diabetes in sub-Saharan Africa

Reviewer's code: 00506347

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-06 20:07

Date reviewed: 2015-06-08 05:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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"/> 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is quite interesting. It certainly makes sense as a problem but i don't think i have ever seen this presented in this way. I think you need to drive home you point with more emphasis. I think you need more background demographics for the countries in terms of per capita income for various jobs (farmer, doctor, government worker, etc to get a better sense of who has what income level. The figures and tables need top be simplified top keep their point. I think it would be best to do them for one country and then write how things differ for the other countries since they are vary similar and you are trying to say the same message.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 20430

Title: Simple calculator to estimate the medical cost of diabetes in sub-Saharan Africa

Reviewer's code: 00504962

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-06 20:07

Date reviewed: 2015-06-16 10:17

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study provided objective evidence for the exorbitant medical cost of diabetes in sub-Saharan Africa. The minimum estimated cost for the treatment of uncomplicated diabetes would amount to 21% - 34% of the country's gross national income per capita, 26% - 47% in the presence of retinopathy, and above 70% for nephropathy. The topic is interesting and important in the field. The reviewer would like to know a difference between the cost-effectiveness data in sub-Saharan Africa and other countries. In addition, it would be better to add a scenario for cost saving in sub-Saharan Africa.