

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 57014

Title: Comparing the incidence of major cardiovascular events and severe microvascular complications in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02650654

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-27

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-09-02 05:54

Reviewer performed review: 2020-09-02 06:05

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please, discuss the patho-physiology of the diabetes microvascular complications.
You can underline the microvascular complication in coronary artery system.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 57014

Title: Comparing the incidence of major cardiovascular events and severe microvascular complications in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00506409

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-27

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-10-10 08:09

Reviewer performed review: 2020-10-10 10:07

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript presents a meta-analysis on the incidence of macrovascular and microvascular complications in patients with type 2 diabetes. This is an important topic in the management of the ever-expanding population of patients with type 2 diabetes. This report is a revision of the original manuscript. This reviewer has not contributed to the review of the original manuscript, and there is only one statement in the response by the authors on the comments made on the original manuscript. It is therefore not possible to judge whether there were more comments on the original manuscript: changes in the manuscript are not indicated. This reviewer has therefore not conducted a thorough review of the revised manuscript as is done in the review of an original manuscript, but only conducted a review as done in the process of a revision. Some comments are as follows:

- The flow diagram of the selection procedure of publications for this analysis does not include the selection criteria mentioned in the section "Study selection".
- In the selection process it is not mentioned whether studies included those in which special drugs were tested, i.e., what was the aim/focus of individual manuscripts selected? This is not clear in Table 1. In the results it is stated that "...12 eligible studies, participants from five studies were considered representative of the general patients with T2DM." This needs clarification and detail, as this differs from the selection criteria. Note that the study includes cohort studies and clinical trials, but the nature of the clinical trials is not disclosed.
- In the results it is stated "Finally, eight cohorts from eight cohort studies[33-40] and eight cohorts from four clinical trials[41-45], were eligible and finally included in the analyses." This makes 16 studies, but only 13 references are given, and there are 12 studies in Table 1 and Figure 1: in contrast, there are 16 studies in Figure 2, and 16 cohorts is mentioned in the first sentence of the discussion. The different numbers are quite confusing, and need a careful

check. Apparently there are some studies which provided more than one cohort, but this is insufficiently detailed. • The results present data on analysis of subgroups according to age, study design, length of follow-up and duration of diabetes (Table 2). There is no rationale presented in the selection of subgroups. Normally this follows a multivariate analysis in which potential parameters that affect the outcome (microvascular or macrovascular complications) are analysed. This is not done in the present study. • In Table 1 it appears that there are huge differences in incidence of macrovascular and microvascular complications between the various studies. This needs an explanation with regard of the definition/characteristics of the various studies. It is questionable to present data after combination of data from these studies, even restricting this to the RR as parameter. The section on study limitations needs revision in this regard.