PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 78432

Title: Disordered eating behaviour and eating disorder among adolescents with type 1 diabetes: integrative review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04668002

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: DDS, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Sweden

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-27 09:53

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-27 10:03

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
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

01 The Discussion looks like a patchwork of results from the included studies, without an actual discussion of the results of the present review.   02 The Conclusion is too long and without focus. The following is a little repetition of Methods and a little repetition of Results: "The analysed evidence concerning the validated instruments that examined disordered eating behaviour and eating disorders among adolescents with Type 1 diabetes have the main purpose of performing these grievances' screening and evaluation risk. Of the total amount of thirteen studies, three evaluated eating disorders and ten, the disordered eating behaviour." Nothing was "proved". "Prove" is very strong word here: "The high scores demonstrated in the tools prove (…)" The following is a recommendation, not a conclusion, and should be placed at the end of the Discussion: "Based on these instruments' analysis, the health professionals can elaborate on actions of prevention and handling of the grievances associated with eating disorders."   03 What is the meta-analysis of this review? It is in the title of the manuscript!

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 78432

Title: Disordered eating behaviour and eating disorder among adolescents with type 1 diabetes: integrative review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05630791

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-26 18:13

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-27 16:27

Review time: 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] 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

The topic is extremely interesting, the research is well conducted and written in a clear manner. Please add a paragraph regarding the limitations of the study.