

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 88836

**Title:** Investigating the Relationship between Intracranial Atherosclerotic Plaque Remodeling and Diabetes Using High-Resolution Vessel Wall Imaging

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05914645

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-10-11 07:41

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-10-16 12:01

**Review time:** 5 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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 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

1 The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. 2 The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. 3 The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4 The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. 5 The manuscript describes methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail. 6 The research objectives were achieved in the study the authors showed high-resolution vessel wall imaging may be used to evaluate the intracerebral arteries. 7 Discussion. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner? The discussion is accurate and it discusses the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice. 8 The figure, diagrams, and tables are of good quality and appropriately illustrative. 9 The manuscript meets the requirements of biostatistics? 10 The manuscript used a ratio hence SI units were not used. 11 The manuscript appears to appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections.

The authors do not self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references. 12 The manuscript is generally well, concisely and coherently organized and presented, 13 The authors did not provide evidence of which category was used to prepare manuscript.s 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? There are a few points that must be brought to the attention of the authors or the authors must provide clarification on: 1. ABSTRACT: The last sentence in the abstract is too strong and may be modified or completely removed without losing the essence of what the manuscript is about. The suggested modified version will be suggested under the conclusion for the whole manuscript below. 2. In the second paragraph under MRI protocol to make it clearer to reader I suggest the authors break down sentence to shorter ones as: The scanning protocols included conventional brain and cerebrovascular imaging. The conventional brain imaging included: T1WI, T2WI, fluid-attenuated inversion-recovery (FLAIR), and the cerebrovascular imaging included: 3-dimensional time of flight-MRA (3D TOF-MRA) and high-resolution vascular wall imaging technology HR-VWI: 3D-SPACE sequence. 3. In the continuation of the sentence under consideration in point 2 above. The authors dealt with 5 imaging modalities but they have number up to 6 with nothing under 4 ie 4 and 5 are together please correct 4. In the last sentence of the first paragraph of the Results, the authors should please change "could be" merged to "was" merged. 5. Under the discussion the authors should please change the word coarctation to constriction. 6, In the last statement of the conclusion authors themselves not that further studies are needed thus this statement is too strong based on their results. The authors may consider modifying "and the results of this study provide a basis for the prevention of ischaemic stroke." by introducing the word may and also talk about reducing the incidence and



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

severity of ischaemic stroke by predicting dangerous plaques 7. In looking at factors affecting plaque authors considered total cholesterol but the non-HDL cholesterol or LDL cholesterol may have correlated better with the dangerous plaque why was this not used,

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 88836

**Title:** Investigating the Relationship between Intracranial Atherosclerotic Plaque Remodeling and Diabetes Using High-Resolution Vessel Wall Imaging

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05213310

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-10-25 01:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-10-28 09:21

**Review time:** 3 Days and 7 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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

Dear Author(s), To begin, I'd want to thank the author(s) for their efforts. To improve the study even more, I recommend the following modifications: 1/ Modify the title of the paper to be consistent with the goal of the current study, and keep it to no more than twenty words. 2/ While committing to providing the most essential findings that the current study has reached in the results portion of the study abstract, without delving into excessive detail, balance must be addressed in listing information between the different components of the study abstract. 3/ The introduction/background of the study must be modified in three paragraphs to accomplish the following: - In the first paragraph, explain why the current study is significant. - The second paragraph explains the knowledge gap that the current study seeks to fill. - The third paragraph defines the goal of the current investigation, or, in other words, what research problem the current study attempts to address. 4/ Is there a reason why the current statistical method was chosen to analyze the study data that can be included in the statistical analysis portion of the procedures section? 5/ Please separate the conclusion and discussion sections. 6/ Is the current study's goal of resolving the research problem



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

met? Please include an answer to this question in the study conclusion. 7/ Some references are out of date and should be replaced; I advocate using references from 2023 and five years before. 8/ I recommend that the author(s) adhere to the journal's policy on producing scientific papers, as there is a pre-prepared template that must be used for font size, line spacing, and other restrictions outlined in the authors' instructions. Good luck,



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 88836

**Title:** Investigating the Relationship between Intracranial Atherosclerotic Plaque Remodeling and Diabetes Using High-Resolution Vessel Wall Imaging

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05213310

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** Xin-Liang Qu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-11-15 23:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-11-15 23:29

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous





**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>

statements

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Author(s), Thank you for your work; I have made no additional modifications; instead, I would like to request that you review some minor grammatical and typographical issues. Best wishes,