

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 86825

**Title:** Rapid correction of hyperglycemia: A necessity but at what price? A Brief report of a patient living with type 1 diabetes

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03674017

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** France

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-11 01:41

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-11 12:28

**Review time:** 10 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Grade A: Excellent    [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Grade B: Good    [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Grade C: Fair [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	[ <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
<b>Conclusion</b>	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Accept (High priority)    [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Accept (General priority) [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Minor revision    [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Major revision    [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Yes    [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

This paper described a case with multiple microvascular complication of diabetes associating with high glucose variability. This paper is highly relevant to latest findings in literature. Please note that this case is NOT a rare condition but a common one. It does not mean that this case is not worthy published. Instead, it is more relevant to show a live person suffering glycaemic fluctuation with a real-story. Please note that the so-called 'rapid correction' means glucose variability, which composed of short-term and long-term variabilities. Both happened in this case. It is critical to discuss these variabilities combining the literature and this particular case (Diabetes Care. 2018 Nov;41(11):2370-2376; J Diabetes Investig. 2022 Sep;13(9):1543-1550; J Clin Med. 2022 Nov 11;11(22):6692; Chin Med J (Engl). 2022 Oct 5;135(19):2294-2300; Diabetes Care. 2020 Feb;43(2):426-432).

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 86825

**Title:** Rapid correction of hyperglycemia: A necessity but at what price? A Brief report of a patient living with type 1 diabetes

**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:** France

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-31 23:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-01 00:02

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

Here are my overall summary and review comments for this manuscript. My suggestion is to accept after revision. Summary: This article reported a rare case of multiple microvascular complications in a diabetic patient after rapid glycemic control, which has certain clinical value. However, as a case report, this manuscript still has large room for improvement in scientific merit, novelty and writing standard. Review comments:

- 1 The literature review should be more comprehensive and highlight the novelty of this study.
- 2 Research methods need to supplement key information to improve reproducibility.
- 3 Add statistical analysis to increase result credibility.
- 4 Discuss the results in more depth and expand the contributions to existing theories.
- 5 Optimize language expression to improve logic and readability.
- 6 Enrich table/figure content and information volume.
- 7 Increase academic rigor and enrich relevant details.

In conclusion, this manuscript has publication value but requires the author to thoroughly address the above issues to improve scientific merit, novelty and readability. I suggest the author revise according to the comments above to strengthen the quality. Here are some specific examples to illustrate the main limitations in each

part for this case report: Introduction: For example, the literature review only cited 3 papers, instead of comprehensively reviewing the current research on the relationship between rapid glucose lowering and microvascular complications. It did not point out the innovative aspect of this study is reporting a rare case with multiple organ complications. Methods: The case description did not provide details such as the patient's daily insulin dosage, glucose monitoring curves, etc. The detection methods and quality control measures for HbA1c, renal function, etc were not described. Results: The results only briefly mentioned the patient's HbA1c dropped from 12% to 7.4%, without statistical analysis like paired t-test. The renal function curve lacked notation of key timepoints and trend analysis. Discussion: It did not thoroughly discuss the mechanisms of rapid glucose lowering induced microvascular injury, only briefly mentioned vascular autoregulation. The major limitation of small sample size preventing statistical analysis was not acknowledged. Here are some specific examples using the figures in the article to illustrate the issues in more detail: Figure 1 gastric emptying scintigraphy: The figure lacks key information like imaging time, radioactive tracer used. No legend was added to explain the differences in radioactive counts in different regions. The delayed gastric emptying phase was not marked on the image. Figure 2 renal function deterioration timeline: The figure lacks statistical analysis, e.g. significance tests comparing creatinine levels between years. The y-axis intervals are uneven, which can cause visual errors. Key timepoints like diagnosis and staging should be denoted on the x-axis. In summary, the two figures in the article have issues with incomplete information, lack of quantitative analysis, and unclear labeling of details.