

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 78803

Title: Orthotic approach to prevention and management of diabetic foot: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05438678

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-16 09:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-23 09:32

Review time: 7 Days

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

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-reviewer	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The current study is on a topic of relevance and general interest to the readers of the journal. I found the review incomplete and not always clear therefore a major review is needed. There are several points to clarify before you can publish it. I explain my concerns in more detail below. Major comments: -Authors declare that the purpose of this narrative review was to provide a reference guide to support clinicians as they prescribe shoe modifications and foot orthoses to treat diabetic foot ulcers and Charcot joints, ma they only partially focus on off-loading for the management of foot ulcers. -The authors make no reference to the IWGDF Guideline on off-loading foot ulcers in persons with diabetes. - Specifically, they do not describe non-removable knee device (or TCC or non-removable walker) with an appropriate foot-device interface as the first-choice of offloading treatment to promote healing of the ulcer. Minor comments: -The authors do not consider important aspects such as common barriers and solutions to using best off-loading treatments. -The bibliographic entries do not report important articles.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 78803

Title: Orthotic approach to prevention and management of diabetic foot: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03229863

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-18 06:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-27 00:15

Review time: 8 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] 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



Baishideng Baishideng Publishing

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-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author summarized current strategies including shoe modifications and foot orthoses to prevent and treat diabetic foot. However, there were some flaws that should be corrected. 1. The definition of diabetic foot is not widely used. In this manuscript, "The diabetic foot is a broadly defined diagnosis encompassing deformities, skin changes, ulcers, ischemia, infections, and neuropathy occurring in the feet of diabetic patients". However, the widely accepted definition of diabetic foot is infection, ulceration, or destruction of tissues of the foot of a person with diabetes mellitus, usually accompanied by neuropathy and/or PAD. "The diabetic foot" in this manuscript actually include patients with high risk of diabetic foot. Thus, it is necessary to modify the title and corresponding content of the manuscript. 2. Page 3, line 49, "The diabetic foot is caused by diabetic foot ulcers," this might be a mistaken. 3. Page 9, the authors arranged a paragraph to describe "charcot arthropathy". In fact, charcot foot is part of diabetic foot. It could be introduced in the introduction part. 4. The mechanism that modified shoes and orthoses could reduce the risk of diabetic foot lies mainly on the offloading. This could be summarized before the detailed description of various modified shoes and orthoses. 5. Page 10, line 243. The prefabricated removable walking brace. It is note worth that nonremovable walkers are the first line suggestions in the IWGDF offloading guideline. Thus, to avoid misunderstanding, corresponding suggestions should be lined in this section.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 78803

Title: Orthotic approach to prevention and management of diabetic foot: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05438678

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-15

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-26 11:30

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-27 12:39

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have considered my suggestion and improved the paper accordingly. I've non further comments on it.