

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82651

Title: Management of diabetes: Current concepts

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-25 14:58

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-25 16:31

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic is of interest, and the manuscript is well illustrated. Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them? 3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82651

Title: Management of diabetes: Current concepts

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06403983

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-27 01:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-02 03:20

Review time: 6 Days and 2 Hours

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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 prevalence of obesity and diabetes is rapidly rising worldwide with adiposity considered the strongest risk factor for developing diabetes. Diabetes, a term that is defined as the combined adverse health effects of obesity and diabetes mellitus, is becoming an increasing concern given how interlinked the two conditions are with effective prevention, management and treatments urgently required. The manuscript under review entitled 'Management of Diabetes: Current Concepts,' aimed to provide an overview of the evidence-based management of diabetes. Overall, the manuscript is well written, providing an up-to-date overview of the evidence on an important and timely topic. The manuscript could however be improved by stating how this manuscript differs from the many other reviews on diabetes (prior to stating the aim in the introduction) as well as adequately highlighting where research in diabetes is still in its infancy and future steps needed to advance research in this field (end of the concluding paragraph). In addition to this, the following should be revised to enhance the quality of the manuscript: 1. In the introduction, in the first sentence '3 decades' should be written as 'three decades.' 2. Also, in the introduction, the second sentence



**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>

‘adverse lifestyle’ should be corrected as ‘adverse lifestyle behaviors.’ 3. In the last sentence of ‘Pathophysiology of Diabetes,’ it would be better if authors could modify this sentence ‘Linking to excess fat consumption, research suggests that excess lipid intake may result in bacterial production of short chain fatty acids, which in turn affect energy balance and metabolism’ - so it is in line with the body of evidence to date. The body of evidence to date is actually conflicting on this, with some research suggesting that short chain fatty acids can help protect against metabolic dysfunction and high fat diet induced obesity (DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2021.02.001>). 4. Under the subheading of ‘Dietary Modifications’ it is more ideal to discuss weight loss as ‘percentage weight loss’ as opposed to ‘kilos’ so it is clinically meaningful.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82651

Title: Management of diabetes: Current concepts

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03270754

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PharmD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-25 11:30

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-04 08:43

Review time: 9 Days and 21 Hours

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

1. The manuscript focus on Management of Diabetes: Current Concepts, after checked the references in Pubmed, many references about Diabetes, but I think this review was more comprehensive and specific . 2. Very interesting, from PATHOPHYSIOLOGY OF DIABESITY , MAJOR COMORBIDITIES TO BE ADDRESSED IN MANAGING DIABESITY , LIFESTYLE MEASURES , DRUG THERAPY , to BARIATRIC PROCEDURES, must let readers including me understand so much current concepts about diabetes. 3. In MAJOR COMORBIDITIES TO BE ADDRESSED IN MANAGING DIABESITY part, such as MAFLD was Italic font; but other part were normal font. 4. A figure depicting the mechanism of Diabetes can be included. 5.The manuscript focus on GLP-1 receptor agonists and SGLT-2 inhibitors introduction containing Figures and Tables, what is reason? 6.The words in Figure 3 not very clear, I think should change another font.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82651

Title: Management of diabetes: Current concepts

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-25

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-06 09:12

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-06 09:14

Review time: 1 Hour

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
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

The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning.