

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 87557

Title: Gut microbiome: New perspectives for type 2 diabetes prevention and treatment

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04419139 **Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-25

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-15 04:31

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-17 11:11

Review time: 2 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



Baishideng

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

https://www.wjgnet.com

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Scientific Quality This review summarizes the current research progress on the relationship between gut microbiota and type 2 diabetes, which has a certain scientificity. The article elaborates on the pathogenesis of gut microbiota in type 2 diabetes from multiple aspects, including bile acids, short-chain fatty acids, endotoxins, etc. It has some scientific value. The article summarizes well that the composition of gut microbiota in type 2 diabetic patients is different from that in normal people, which has a scientific basis. The discussion on therapeutic measures of gut microbiota regulation for type 2 diabetes has applied scientific significance. However, the specific mechanism discussion is not deep enough and lacks definite experimental data support. The article discusses some contents too briefly and needs to be supplemented and expanded, such as the endotoxin mechanism being summarized in only one sentence. It lacks the description of scientific details like research design, technical route, experimental methods, etc. These contents need to be supplemented. Innovativeness Evaluation The review summarizes the relationship between gut microbiota and type 2 diabetes systematically and comprehensively, which has certain innovative value. It proposes gut microbiota as



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https**://www.wjgnet.com

a new therapeutic target for type 2 diabetes and has some innovative insights. But the specific mechanism research is not innovative enough, and stays more in the redescription of existing research results. The gut microbiota regulation therapies also originate mostly from existing literature and need to propose more innovative perspectives. It does not point out the direction for the next step of research, which needs further innovation. Main Deficiencies and Suggestions: The mechanism discussion is not deep enough, more experimental data should be provided to enhance innovation. The treatment methods need to supplement more examples and cannot just stay as a brief overview of the original text. Increase the discussion on the limitations of current research and propose directions for subsequent innovative research. The concluding remarks could give a prospect for future research, to increase the scientific value of the article. During revision, focus on improving the scientificity, rigor, and innovation of the statements as a whole to make the full text more perfected. The key deficiency is that the review lacks solid experimental data support in the mechanism discussion, mainly based on the following points: The statements about the mechanisms are more theoretical and overview in nature, without providing too many specific experimental results. For example, in the bile acid mechanism part, no specific data are given on the impacts of FXR and TGR5 activation on glucose/lipid metabolism; in the short-chain fatty acids section, data are also lacking, such as the effects of different fatty acids on GLP-1 and PYY hormone secretion. The mechanisms mentioned in the article do not list the specific research literature that supports these views. Normally, it should be pointed out which literature first reported a certain mechanism, or which subsequent studies further verified this point. The content in this regard is relatively small in this paper. The elaboration of some mechanisms is too brief, needing expanded discussion and experimental data to support it. For example, the endotoxin mechanism is summarized in just one sentence, without specific results; the obesity relationship is



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

https://www.wjgnet.com

just simply mentioned, without data support. Lack of clear data charts. Usually, the discussion of mechanisms is accompanied by experimental data charts for illustration, but this article also lacks in this aspect. No specific experimental data are provided in aspects like carbohydrate metabolism and glycogen synthesis, which should be the key processes of intestinal bacterial action. In summary, this review needs to supplement experimental result data in the mechanism discussion to improve the persuasiveness and scientificity of the viewpoints.