

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** office@baishideng.com **https:**//www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 89962

Title: Roles of fibroblast growth factors in the treatment of diabetes

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: Associate Professor, Research Associate, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-18 18:30

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-18 18:31

Review time: 1 Hour

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	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: office@baishideng.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

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	[] 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) [] 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

1. 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? 2. Conclusion: not properly written. 3. 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.



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** office@baishideng.com https://www.wjgnet.com

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 89962

Title: Roles of fibroblast growth factors in the treatment of diabetes

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: Associate Professor, Research Associate, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-18

Reviewer chosen by: Cong Lin

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-19 00:14

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-19 00:15

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** office@baishideng.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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.