

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29074

**Title:** Fuzzy expert system for diagnosing diabetic neuropathy

**Reviewer's code:** 00467221

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-29 16:43

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-19 23:38

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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

1. page 4 line 13: change the word "autonomic" to "peripheral" 2. Page 5 line 5 from bottom " As few studies have focused on the use of ...diabetic neuropathy". Is there any study done before? If so, it should be cited. If not, change like "Since no study was done with use of ...". 3. Page 2 abstract and page 8 line 7 from the bottom. The definition of "sensitivity", "precision" and "accuracy" should be mentioned explicitly. In particular difference between "precision" and "accuracy". 4. Spell-out all acronym like CBC, FBS,...ScEx-MNSII in somewhere. 5. Page 8 line 5. "... was compared with the final diagnosis recorded.. " How "final diagnosis" was made? Ultimate diagnosis of diabetic neuropathy is proof of damage by nerve biopsy. However, this invasive method is difficult perform in clinical setting, thus next alternative method is skin biopsy to show reduction in nerve ending. If no morphological studies was done in "final diagnosis", this "final diagnosis" sounds like "consensus diagnosis". Authors should clear about this point.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29074

**Title:** Fuzzy expert system for diagnosing diabetic neuropathy

**Reviewer's code:** 02446542

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-29 16:43

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-28 04:09

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 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input 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 authors describe a system for the diagnosis and evaluation of diabetic neuropathy that seems to be reliable. The manuscript is generally well written although some abbreviations, like "ASP.Net" and "MATLAB", should be defined. Furthermore, it could be useful authors to give some data about the feasibility of the method in daily clinical practice, regarding for example the cost, compared to other systems.