PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 82562

Title: Efficacy of multigrain supplementation in type 2 diabetes mellitus: A pilot study protocol for a randomized intervention trial

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05630677

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-23 10:08

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-23 13:08

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors aimed to determine the efficacy of multigrain supplementation among Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM) patients. This is an interesting subject that may result in interesting findings. Although the methodology of RCTs is important while registering your RCT this information is added while registering and all details are mentioned there. Accordingly, it is not suggested to publish the RCT protocol without results. This manuscript which is written in good English could be evaluated after adding the results.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[　] Grade A: Excellent　　[　] Grade B: Good　　　[　] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [Y] Minor revision　[　] Major revision　[　] Rejection
Re-review	[　] Yes　[Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous　[　] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [　] Yes　[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have conducted an interesting study with the aim of improving the management of T2DM using only a dietary supplement. The approach is very practical and easy to implement for patients with this disease, which has the potential to improve the quality of life of numerous people without apparent side effects. In order to improve the scientific quality of the manuscript, I suggest the following issues/modifications:　- Methods: In the randomization of participants into supplement/control, were demographic, clinical, or medication-related variables taken into account to homogenize the subgroups?　- Will subsequent statistical analysis be performed using case-control analysis methodologies?　- I understand that the variables used in the calculation of the sample size are based on a previous study. However, in my experience with clinical data, I have observed that this type of study does not allow for coherent conclusions using such a small sample size. Therefore, this study can only be defined as a "pilot study". In the "real world," working with patients involves enormous heterogeneity, and the larger the sample size, the more credible the results will be.　Kind regards.