

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16649

**Title:** Impact of new technologies on diabetes care

**Reviewer's code:** 00503391

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-28 10:53

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-24 22:04

| CLASSIFICATION   | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing     | Google Search:                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing           | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <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"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor                 |  | BPG Search:                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|  |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review by Giani et. al., the authors have addressed a timely and important topic of Type 1 diabetes management with a focus on new advancements and barriers in the adaptation of new technologies. This is a very well researched and written manuscript, which will be useful for those practicing and researching in this area.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16649

**Title:** Impact of new technologies on diabetes care

**Reviewer's code:** 00227633

**Reviewer's country:** Portugal

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-28 10:53

**Date reviewed:** 2015-05-02 18:56

| CLASSIFICATION   | LANGUAGE EVALUATION   | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                              | 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"/> [ ] The same title        | <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"/> [ ] Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Fair                   | <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Rejected                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No       | <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade E: Poor                   |   | BPG Search:  | <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision                |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title        |  |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication |  |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Plagiarism            |  |
|  |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No       |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would recommend the following: 1) Abstract should be more quantitative as possible, in order to favour the interest of the paper and for rapid comparison with other papers. 2) In the last 5 years many studies have been performed with metabolic control and diabetes in many other processes and complications, such as in immunosuppressors or antidepressives drugs. The authors should also referred to these and others studies from the last 2 or 3 years, in order to improve the paper and present it properly with recent data (even from 2015 as well more from 2014), for instance from authors such as: Jan Erikson, Ulf Smith, etc, also showing a biochemical angle of the processes.