

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 83817

**Title:** Association of bone turnover biomarkers with severe intracranial and extracranial artery stenosis in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06058823

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Research Associate

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-06 08:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-09 08:29

**Review time:** 3 Days

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

<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 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 checked="" 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 article was well-written. Si-Cong Si et al. investigated the association of BTM levels with severe intracranial and extracranial artery stenosis in patients with T2DM. Clinical studies to date have mainly studied the associations among different BTMs and atherosclerosis, whereas few studies have explored the correlations between BTM levels and severe intracranial and extracranial artery stenosis in T2DM patients. So, this article was interesting and informative regarding with artery stenosis in T2DM. I have several concerns. 1. Although this cross-sectional study included a total of 257 patients, only 33 had some form of stenosis. Will this influence the results of the study? 2. The authors need to clearly define inclusion and exclusion criteria in the text.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 83817

**Title:** Association of bone turnover biomarkers with severe intracranial and extracranial artery stenosis in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06058812

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-06 06:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-13 01:35

**Review time:** 6 Days and 18 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

<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 checked="" 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

The manuscript describes the associations among BTM levels, previous stroke, and the burden and location of intracranial and extracranial artery stenosis in T2DM patients. The topic of the review is relevant for clinicians involved in diabetes management. This study is very useful. The title reflects the main subject of the article, abstract and keywords well summarize the arguments. The methodology is described in detail and is well structured. The discussion is well articulated according to results and the authors have clearly underlined the limitations and drawbacks of the manuscript. The tables and figures are representatives and of good quality. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest and authoritative references. However, the only regret is that there is too much content in the DISCUSSION section, and some of the content can be incorporated into the background. DISCUSSION should be focused on what they found and learned, and comparison with previous evidence.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 83817

**Title:** Association of bone turnover biomarkers with severe intracranial and extracranial artery stenosis in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06058868

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Research Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-03 01:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-13 02:19

**Review time:** 10 Days

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

<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 checked="" 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

The study is aimed to determine whether BTMs are associated with intracranial and extracranial atherosclerosis and investigate the value of BTMs as potential indicators for risk assessment and intervention targets for severe intracranial and extracranial artery stenosis in T2DM patients. Major comments: The study is well planned and well written. Minor comments: a. Abstract is not very informative, as it does not contain new information. I would include a summary of introduction. b. Authors need to summarize a Core tip to present the core content of the article. c. In some parts of the discussion section, the authors seem repeating the result rather than discussing their findings. The authors can use their findings to add recommendations at the end of the discussion section. d. Additionally, minor language polishing is needed.