

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86168

Title: Mechanism and recent updates on insulin-related disorders

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-04 15:27

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-05 02:08

Review time: 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The discussion section is modest. 3. Abstract: not properly written. 4. Conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86168

Title: Mechanism and recent updates on insulin-related disorders

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02461627

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Arab Emirates

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-03 18:30

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-06 18:42

Review time: 3 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The manuscript entitled “Mechanism and recent updates on insulin disorders” and authored by Kumar et al reviewed the insulin disorders and the underlying mechanisms associated with insulin pathophysiology. The following investigations should be integrated to enrich the discussion: PMID: 33255507, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41936-020-00177-9>, PMID: 34639131, <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajps.2018.96091>, <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajptsp.2007.4.9>, PMID: 29959408, PMID: 17151320, PMID: 35531567, PMID: 36432184, PMID: 35740022, PMID: 35177980, <https://patentscope.wipo.int/search/en/detail.jsf?docId=WO2021009706>, <https://patentscope.wipo.int/search/en/detail.jsf?docId=WO2020174446>, PMID: 36139719, <https://patents.google.com/patent/JP2020132625A/en>, PMID: 35211395, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12645-022-00144-9>. One major concern that should be addressed: What time range of publication did this review article cover, what keywords did the search for literature include, what were the inclusion criteria, how many studies did the search find and how many were primary research vs review articles, of those,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

how many were selected for evaluation in this study, and finally what criteria were used for selecting the articles that were reviewed (was it the subject of the study, its novelty or both). Other clear setback is lacking in-depth coverage of relevant patents. Other comments • Massive proofreading is REQUIRED. • Abbreviations list must be added. • Figures' legends should be more descriptive. • Adding a conclusion figure would be useful. • If integrated, the following studies could enrich the discussion: PMID: 34662244, PMID: 26641660, PMID: 36757420.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86168

Title: Mechanism and recent updates on insulin-related disorders

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02446526

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: FRCP, MD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Consultant Physician-Scientist, Professor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-04 08:39

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-10 12:32

Review time: 6 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Manuscript "Mechanism and recent updates on insulin disorders - WJD-No: 86168" was reviewed with interest. Unfortunately, the paper is written in such a manner that it wouldn't qualify the criteria for publication in a good quality biomedical periodical, especially in the high-quality World Journal of Diabetes with a current impact factor of 4.56. I have just pointed out only some major errors in the paper as almost every paragraph there are several mistakes to point out. General comments: - A narrative review article should elaborate current evidence on a topic with logical arguments procured from existing latest literature in authors view. However, authors have simply gathered some points from literature and presented them in a simple narrative without any contribution from their side in a totally haphazard manner. Authors should have at least read few recent reviews published in the WJD before presenting this paper. - There is no proper order of the presentation e.g., important to less important, common to uncommon, uncertainties in the evidence etc. etc.. - There are a huge lot of factual errors (some of which I have pointed out below: Language & style: - The language quality is horrible with a huge lot of errors throughout the paper which are not

salvageable without rewriting the paper with someone who have proficiency in writing a review paper.!. Title: - The title is inappropriate as authors are not presenting the recent updates I am afraid. A better title should have been somewhat like "Mechanisms of insulin-related disorders +/- :recent updates" as insulin disorders may convey also covey a faulty impression of abnormalities in the insulin molecule itself. Abstract and Core tip: - Should have given a brief summary of evidence presented in the paper. - There are several factual errors in these sections themselves Introduction: - The first sentence itself is wrong regarding the number of amino-acids in insulin. In my knowledge insulin has only 51 amino-acids. Unsure if authors have invented any new insulin.!. - In my knowledge c-peptide is the connecting peptide (not the crucial peptide). - A proper introduction of a review should show how the authors are planning to narrate the review with some core ideas of the paper to enhance reader experience with which they will read the entire paper. Authors have described mechanism of insulin secretion and action (??? reaction.!!) and simply narrated the various disorders related to insulin biology & actions.!. - I don't understand how authors created new terminologies type 1 IDDM and type 2 IDDM in the next sections. Several abbreviations in the paper are not explained properly and there are errors in these two paragraphs (e.g. juvenile with HLA-DR4-DQ2.....; primary cause of T2DM is progressive progressive impairment of insulin secretion - it is not cause but often consequence.!.) - GDM section is given more importance with again errors and jargons (e.g., GCK-related diabetes in pregnancy doesn't fall in the category of GDM). - For authors information: Insulin pump, islet transplantation... are not in the emerging stage (I have been conducting pump clinics over the past one and half decades.!.) Insulinoma: - This section should have come in the end considering the rarity of the condition but given a lot of importance again with errors (e.g., the 72-hour fasting test is described erroneously). - Insulinoma as such is a review topic and authors here just gave

some narrative which are probably useful for a medical student or lay man. Metabolic syndrome: - Again this section should have been earlier and with T2DM or earlier to describe the role of IR in human disease including T2DM, PCOS, MAFLD (not at all mentioned by authors) and cancer biology in relation to it. I haven't wasted time to analyze the errors here as there are so many.!!.. PCOS & mRNA: Again errors and out of context mRNA in a small subsection like this.!!.. Neurological disorder: - This is quite vague and irrelevant points too. Cancers: - There are are 12 different forms of cancers in relation to MS, but unsure why authors limited only to only 3. - No comments about many errors here too, Figures: Except figure 5 others are substandard quality in the scientific content and 5 is out of context too. Conclusions: - Not succinct as expected Tables: - several points could have been in appropriate tables making lives of the readers easy..!!.. References: Many are inappropriate as authors have narrated simply some points not relevant for a good quality review. Overall, I am very confused what this paper will add to our knowledge base on insulin-related disorders.!

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86168

Title: Mechanism and recent updates on insulin-related disorders

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02461627

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Arab Emirates

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-07 11:24

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-07 11:37

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Some of the comments were not sufficiently addressed.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86168

Title: Mechanism and recent updates on insulin-related disorders

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-07 21:14

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-07 21:14

Review time: 1 Hour

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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The discussion section is modest. 3. Abstract: not properly written. 4. Conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.