

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: 89974

Title: Association of age at diagnosis of diabetes with subsequent risk of age-related

ocular diseases and vision acuity

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05136305 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Full Professor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-26 09:03

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-26 16:18

**Review time:** 7 Hours

	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] 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	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



## Baishideng

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	[ Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] 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) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] 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 study is important and well-written It concluded that younger age at diagnosis of diabetes is associated with a larger relative risk of incident ocular diseases and vision loss reflects the detailed findings and discussions presented in the full manuscript. The authors listed inclusion and exclusion criteria in the "Materials and Methods" section of the study. They mention the initial population base as participants of the UK Biobank aged 40-73 years at baseline between 2006 and 2010. By stating who was excluded, the authors make their research design and the resulting dataset clear, which is essential for understanding the study's context and for any subsequent analyses or replication attempts. For the novelty of the work, the text suggests that this study is the first to use the UK Biobank to examine the association of age at diagnosis of diabetes with main ocular conditions. The study's claim to novelty is supported by the statement that no previous study has investigated the impact of age at diagnosis of diabetes on the association between diabetes and cataract, and by their findings on the independent risk associated with diabetes for ocular conditions and vision loss. The discussion also highlights how the findings contribute to the existing body of knowledge by providing



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: office@baishideng.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

new insights into the associations between diabetes diagnosed at different ages and ocular diseases, and by suggesting potential mechanisms for these associations. Therefore, based on the text provided, the study does present novel findings that contribute to the understanding of the relationship between diabetes and ocular health. Although that authors attributed the macular degeneration to damage is the blood vessels, but it is helpful if they highlight and explain more on this. Citations and References: The inclusion of studies prior to to date, especially foundational or landmark studies, is also common as they provide necessary historical context or are often the basis for current research directions. Authors list does contain few references from the specified recent years, it's important to note that the majority of the references range from 2005 to 2020. In f In rapidly evolving field like medical research, where recent findings can be crucial, it's often expected that the literature review includes a significant portion of recent studies, in addition to ideally within the last five years. However, As we are currently in 2023, the most recent references date back at least three years which made unacceptable gap. It is generally necessary to include the most current literature to reflect the latest findings. Therefore, it would importantly be adding a review of the literature to include more recent studies from 2021 to 2023.