

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 63902

**Title:** Association between admission hemoglobin level and prognosis in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus

**Reviewer's code:** 05824426

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Ethiopia

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-03-04 05:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-03-15 07:45

**Review time:** 11 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Reviewer's comments for authors (code; 05824426) Title: Association between admission hemoglobin level and prognosis in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus Title number: 63902 Reviewer's comments for authors according to the checklist of the journals 1.

Title: Yes, the title reflects the hypothesis of the manuscript 2. The abstract was written interestingly and summarizes the works under manuscript, but it is better if the authors re-write the abstract in line with the scientific way of writing by separating different sections; like background; aims, methods, and materials, result, a conclusion with some implication. In addition the purpose of the study (significance of the study) is not included in the abstract and introduction section too. Please incorporate the purpose of the study 3. Yes, the keywords were reflecting the focus of the study 4. Background: The authors described the backgrounds of the study concisely and adequately, however; the magnitudes of the problem and how either low or high hemoglobin level was associated is not described well. Also, the purpose or significance of the study is not described. 5. Methods: the method of the study is not described in an adequate way, the authors must amend the methodology sections of the study before acceptance of the manuscript for publication. a. How they selected the participants, from where? (Criteria for selections of the participants)?. b. How they were excluded? Through physical examination, reviewing the records, interview of patients, or performing the different biochemical tests? It is not clear for readers? c. How those laboratory data like fasting glycemia, glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c), serum creatinine (Scr), 24-h urinary protein, hemoglobin, serum albumin (ALB), serum uric acid (SUA), blood urea nitrogen (BUN), total cholesterol (TC), and triglycerides (TG) were measured, and procedures, instruments used to measures those variables; how the performance of the instruments was checked is not described adequately?. d. How the major causes of

renal damages were excluded? Or confounders? e. How GFR was measured? Is not described in an appropriate way f. As a retrospective design of the study; is that really possible to controls those confounding factors appropriately. Maybe the authors got some variable of the patients from an electronic source or medical records and take us confounding variable? How was the quality of the data maintained? Because at the end of the days finding of the study was concluded based on consideration of controlling those variables. g. How the distribution of the data was tested, or by which method? It is not described well? h. How does the stage of the CKD categorize? i. How the quality of data was maintained (performance of analyzers)? Especially for Hgb, glucose, lipid profile, proteins, enzymes?. Please amend all those points raised here? 6. Results:

The author describes the result coherently and logically; the objectives of the study were achieved well, the study was made a good substantial contribution to the progress of fields. 7. Discussion: the discussion section was written in a concise, clear, and logical way. The finding of the study was interpreted and reported appropriately and adequately. It describes scientific significance and relevance to clinical practices sufficiently. However, authors should remove p-value and HR from the discussion sections 8. Tables were properly illustrated content of the papers and prepared in good quality. 9. How normality of the data checked is not described well? Including the methods. The measurement method of some variables was not clearly indicated? 10.

The authors used appropriate SI units, but not clarified the abbreviation section/Foote notes of the tables 11. Authors used latest and updated reference, cited properly and listed in a correct order 12. The manuscript is written concisely and coherently and well organized and presented 13. the author prepared the manuscript in accordance with the guide line of basic study, however, the abstract, method, and materials section is not written in a sufficient way 14. the manuscripts meet ethical requirements and got approval from the review committee



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)