



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 81275

Title: Vitamin D deficiency among outpatients and hospitalized patients with diabetic foot ulcers: A systematic review and meta-analysis.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05542838

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Italy

Author’s Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-24

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-08 09:15

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-15 16:56

Review time: 7 Days and 7 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 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 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 topic of the study would be interesting; DFS is a very complex complication in clinical practice with a major economic burden on health care systems; the search is based on 12 articles with a total of 7619 patients. The methodological approach appears correct, the data are clear and well reported in the tables. The introduction would need more discussion of the pathology under investigation and its possible complications and classifications in the literature. The discussion could be improved by citing recent reviews : PMID: 36769345 - PMID: 35428527. The conclusions appear to be in line with the study plan. Citation 43 is present in the references but is missing in the text. In addition, English revision would be needed to improve the fluency of the text. As it stands, the manuscript could be published after major revision.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 81275

Title: Vitamin D deficiency among outpatients and hospitalized patients with diabetic foot ulcers: A systematic review and meta-analysis.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 03769068

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Brazil

Author’s Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-24

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-23 13:12

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-23 16:03

Review time: 2 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 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have now reviewed your paper and recognize the importance of your research question. Manuscript NO. 81275 aimed to investigate the association between diabetic foot ulcers and vitamin D levels. 1) Manuscript formatting should be revised according to BPG guidelines. 2) Overall, the Abstract should be further improved. Consider the Abstract as the section that will draw readers' attention to your manuscript. There is no clear delineation of the study's BACKGROUND. METHODS subsection should be more detailed. 3) The INTRODUCTION does not establish a clear rationale for the correlation between Vitamin D and diabetic foot ulcers. 4) In a Systematic Review, the METHODS used should be thoroughly described. The reliability of the results obtained in the Meta-Analysis depends on the methodological quality employed. To avoid bias, a systematic review should be conducted by at least two authors. Non-compliance with this prerequisite compromises the reliability of your results. There is also no mention of critical appraisal tools in the METHODS section. 5) The DISCUSSION and RESULTS sections should be improved.