

# ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8298

**Title:** Comparison between conventional insulin treatment and intravenous insulin infusion therapy in patients with acute coronary syndrome: a pilot study

**Reviewer code:** 00037668

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-25 12:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-04 02:43

| CLASSIFICATION  | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | RECOMMENDATION                      | CONCLUSION   |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing     | Google Search:                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing           | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)                 |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

in this study the authors investigate the effectiveness of a nurse-implemented insulin infusion protocol vs. standard subcutaneous insulin treatment in a population of type 2 diabetic patients. The overall goal was to determine whether the insulin infusion protocol as implemented by nurse would be beneficial in controlling glycemia variation and limit future cardiovascular complications in these patients. The sample size was 44 patients overall, divided almost evenly between the two groups (23 vs. 21, respectively). The provided results indicate that insulin-infused patients presented increased glycemic variability with a significant increase in glycemic variation and possible severe hypo-glycemic events. Overall, the results suggest the absence of any real therapeutic benefit of the nurse-implemented insulin infusion protocol in type 2 diabetic patients. This result also undermines the possibility that such an intensive therapeutic protocol might be beneficial in attenuation the incidence of diabetic cardiomyopathy or diabetic cardiovascular complications in these patients. The study is properly conducted and no issues are noticed with its implementation. It would have been helpful if the authors had provided a rational for using type 2 diabetic patients rather than a type 1 population in their study, as type 2 patients by definition tend to be less responsive to insulin treatment. Also, it would have been useful if the authors had indicated which pharmacological treatments these patients had undergone prior to entering this study, as the previous use of different oral anti-diabetic drugs might provide a better break-down of the population's response to the in-hospital treatment.

# ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8298

**Title:** Comparison between conventional insulin treatment and intravenous insulin infusion therapy in patients with acute coronary syndrome: a pilot study

**Reviewer code:** 02444743

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-25 12:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-06 17:19

| CLASSIFICATION   | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | RECOMMENDATION                      | CONCLUSION   |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)               | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing                    | Google Search:                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Accept          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Grade B (Very good) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y] Grade B: minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of                        | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)                    | language polishing   | BPG Search:                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records |  |

# COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors compared the conventional insulin treatment and intravenous insulin infusion therapy in type 2 diabetic ACS patients, even if they did not find the benefit of GLUCV by insulin infusion therapy, the pilot study addressed an important area and results are very interesting. Some minor concerns need to be addressed. 1. There are some spell mistakes in text. Such as, Page 4, eligable; Page 8, prolungation; Page 14-15, Lenght and patiens. 2. When the abbreviation of words was defined first in the text, followed by abbreviation, not by full words. For example, glucose variability (GLUCV) also used the full words in next text.

**ESPS Peer-review Report**
**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8298

**Title:** Comparison between conventional insulin treatment and intravenous insulin infusion therapy in patients with acute coronary syndrome: a pilot study

**Reviewer code:** 02444959

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-25 12:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-09 22:26

| CLASSIFICATION  | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | RECOMMENDATION                      | CONCLUSION   |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing | Google Search:                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of                | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)                 | language polishing   | BPG Search:                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The present manuscript deals with a very interesting topic: comparison between intravenous insulin therapy and conventional insulin treatment. The main criticism arises from the reduced number of participants as the authors point; however, this study could be considered as a first step in this approach. - Material and methods: Section "Methods". Please, provide the name of the first author for infusion protocol followed instead of mentioning the reference number ("...protocol as proposed by (21)..."). - References: Please, check that all references have the style of the journal. There are some typographical errors that require attention.