

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 85664

Title: Risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with diabetes mellitus comorbid with upper urinary tract calculi

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06521186

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-12 09:01

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-20 06:56

Review time: 7 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

In the manuscript “Risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with diabetes mellitus comorbid with upper urinary tract calculi”, the authors tried to analyze the risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with DM complicated with UUTCs by logistic regression. Until now, the risk factors for concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with UUTCs and DM are still under investigation. Gou JJ et al. performed a single-center retrospective study of 204 patients with DM complicated with UUTCs. They successfully predicted high-risk patients by establishing a risk model, which was beneficial to clinical and targeted treatment and prevention. Finally, they revealed that gender, age, history of lumbago and abdominal pain, operation time, U-LEU and U-GLU were independent risk factors for concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with DM and UUTCs. The topic of this work is interesting. Their conclusion might provide additional information for clinical diagnosis and treatment of DM and UUTCs. The manuscript is well written and well organized, and authors presented also the limitations of the study. I recommend that the manuscript can be published.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 85664

Title: Risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with diabetes mellitus comorbid with upper urinary tract calculi

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06520929

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-12 00:27

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-20 22:27

Review time: 8 Days and 22 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

I read the manuscript written by Gou JJ and others with great interest. In my honest opinion, the topic is interesting and the retrospectively studies novel enough to attract the readers' attention. They successfully predicted high-risk patients by establishing a risk model, which was beneficial to clinical and targeted treatment and prevention. Title: Appropriate. It reflects the main content of the study. Authorship: Is correct. Institutions: are correct. Abstract: Is a structured abstract according to the required format. In 263 words authors showed a summary of the content of the manuscript. Key words: 4 that reflect the content of the study. However, I suggest adding another 3-5 keywords that reflect the theme. Core Tip: In 78 words authors reflect properly aspects that should call attention to the readers. Background: Urinary sepsis is frequently seen in patients with DM complicated with upper urinary tract calculi. Currently, the known risk factors of urinary sepsis are not uniform. Method: Authors made the detailed description of the investigations. Results: The author clearly presents the data to be observed in the method. Discussion: Authors made a detailed an informative discussion of the results. Illustrations: They show 1 figure and 5 tables with their corresponding legend. All figure

and tables are showing clearly making and adequate support of the results. Biostatistics: This work met the requirements of biostatistics. References: The references are quite appropriate to the subject of research. Comments to the author: In this manuscript authors investigate the risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with diabetes mellitus comorbid with upper urinary tract calculi and construct a risk prediction model. Their findings are helpful to identify high-risk patients at an early stage and implement active and effective intervention measures to reduce complications and improve the prognosis of patients.