

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 22450

Title: The role of Vitamin D in Diabetes Mellitus and Chronic Kidney Disease

Reviewer's code: 02446525

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-05 23:18

Date reviewed: 2015-10-19 16:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

the normal physiology of vitamin D and that of diabetes I and II and CKD can be skipped and more emphasis provided on the pathophysiology and actions of vitamin D on prevention/ delaying the onset of the diseases mentioned.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 22450

Title: The role of Vitamin D in Diabetes Mellitus and Chronic Kidney Disease

Reviewer's code: 00503286

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-05 23:18

Date reviewed: 2015-10-26 03:02

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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper "The role of Vitamin D in Diabetes Mellitus and Chronic Kidney Disease" should be published in World Journal of Diabetes, after minor corrections with the editor.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 22450

Title: The role of Vitamin D in Diabetes Mellitus and Chronic Kidney Disease

Reviewer's code: 02446566

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-05 23:18

Date reviewed: 2015-11-03 20:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In page 6, percentage of subjects with hypovitamin D is confusing. If "almost one half " have low level during winter and spring, it may sound strange that 15.4% have low level in winter and fall and 46.6% have low level in spring and summer. In page 7 the reference number 28 at "Powe et al [28]" is duplicated. The author says that racial differences in the prevalence of DBP gene polymorphisms provide a likely explanation for this observation. For this explanation, the effect of polymorphism of DBP gene should be either low expression level of DBP gene, lower affinity for vitamin D or low efficiency in megalin-mediated reabsorption. In ref 28, two polymorphisms are studied. SNP rs7041 and rs4588 cause substitution of Asp to Glu at residue 432 and Thr to Lys at residue 436, respectively. Do these substitution cause change in affinity?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

ESPS manuscript NO: 22450

Title: The role of Vitamin D in Diabetes Mellitus and Chronic Kidney Disease

Reviewer's code: 00507108

Reviewer's country: Israel

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-05 23:18

Date reviewed: 2015-11-04 20:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting and well written review. The title is well chosen and makes it clear that this is not a promotion of Vitamin D as a treatment. The conclusion is balanced and reflects the evidence. The Abstract is less objective in my opinion, for example the statement that "the immune modulatory properties of vit D may play an important role in the prevention and progression of type 1 Diabetes". The evidence presented in the paper suggests only that vitamin D is involved in the immune regulatory pathway and deficiency of vitamin D disturbs this pathway. Similarly the authors give the evidence that vitamin D is involved in insulin signalling but not in particular in type 2 Diabetes.. The core tip again overstates the excellent review of the literature. Surely the evidence is that vitamin D plays an essential role in insulin and glucose metabolism and vitamin D metabolism is disturbed in chronic kidney disease. The uncertainty as to whether this disturbance can be rectified by treatment and whether the addition of excess vitamin D can improve the underlying pathology is clearly stated in the last 2 lines of the abstract. The introduction on the physiology of vitamin D is useful and clearly written. It would be useful to have some discussion of the evidence that produced the definition of vitamin D deficiency. The problem is in the definition. 40

nmol/l or 10 nmol/l Ref 33 is a review and does not seem appropriate for the statement. Ref 36 also not appropriate. Ref 38 is missing. Ref 39 is a Mendelian randomisation study. In the section on Type 2 diabetes 2nd para page 12 should the last line not be ..."and type 2 DM is NOT causal?" Has 'not' been omitted? I am surprised at the statement on page 14 'Whether vitamin D supplementation improves glycaemic control or prevents incident type 2 DM is not clear' All the evidence presented suggests that it is very clear and the answer is no. The authors might consider rephrasing their conclusion of the presented data. Refr 106 does not seem to support the statement on all cause mortality. Would the article by Skaaby T in Danish Med J 2015 be helpful? Is the risk for end stage renal disease higher in patients with low vit D status or is the risk of low vitamin D status higher in patients with end stage renal disease? Ref 107 does not show a significant statistical association with all cause mortality. In conclusion an interesting well written review which I enjoyed reading.