

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: 90314

Title: Non-pharmacological interventions for diabetic peripheral neuropathy: Are we

winning the battle?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07717220 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-06 13:43

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-14 08:31

Review time: 7 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [Y] 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	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
conclusion in this manuscript	[] 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: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1.I have searched for relevant papers in the field, and Medline alone has at least 50 related articles, including systematic reviews and even meta-analyses. Therefore, I urgently need to know where your article's innovation lies. 2.I think it is unreasonable to have only 21 references as a review.