BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes
ESPS manuscript NO: 31065
Title: Effect of medicinal mushrooms on blood cells under conditions of diabetes mellitus
Reviewer's code: 00227633
Reviewer's country: Portugal
Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song
Date sent for review: 2016-10-31 17:10
Date reviewed: 2017-01-03 00:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author's purpose of the investigation is very interesting, also for scientists from related research fields. Suggestions are described below: 1) The title should be short and concise. According to recent studies that would favor future citations to the paper. What is really new in the review paper? The mushrooms on blood cells? the mushrooms on diabetes type I or type II or both? The mode of action of the mushrooms? 2) Abstract should be also quantitative as possible for rapid comparison with others studies, referring also to amounts used or concentration and the effects quantified as possible. Although the abs should be the mirror of the paper, after reading the paper it that some data is missing. Some methodological specifications are not needed at this stage. 3) The paper includes about 10% (13) of recent references from the last 5 years (since 2012, but it should be clearly higher). Besides, references from 2016 are absent! 4) The introduction should clearly state why these review is interesting and timely, and what is the wider relevance or impact of this work? All the points 1 to 4 would in the paper even more sound and solid. 5) Please avoid the sentence like "Obtained results showed significant growth of body weight of control rats to the end of the experiment while body

weight of diabetic animals significantly decreased". But how much?? two-fold? 2%.? If it is no significant, statistically no need to be mention, but if it increases the information about how much was the increase is relevant for comparison with others studies. In that case, the mode of administrations, time upon exposition and the amount/concentration and the model should, among others methodological aspects, should be indicate for instance in a Table or Tables. The description of several studies in random and such as phenomenological type of written induces a diffusion of the final message of the paper. Therefore, tables are needed to summarize the studies so far performed. 6) Also avoided sentences that are paragraphs such as "To quantify the content of apoptotic cells, the apoptotic index was calculated, i.e., the ratio between cells with morphological apoptotic features and the general quantity of cells". Please add figures at several parts of the review in order to illustrates the message of the paper, if these results ad figures are worthy for the authors and include in the legend of the figures the relevant methodology information. 7) Several sections must be divided in sub-section and with a message for each to avoid misunderstandings', such sentences like: "Besides the abovementioned glucans, A. brasiliensis also contains low-molecular weight compounds such as tocopherol, ergosterol, phenols, etc.[114] and metal ions (e.g., copper, zinc, etc.)[89,115] that can inhibit formation of free radicals and the development of oxidative stress due to their scavenger properties". First, what are the amounts of the metals in these samples, micra, nano g per g? The amounts are important once "sola dosis facitis venenum", according to Paracelsus, there is nothing without poison. That should be discussed and referred in the paper, once we are talking about mushrooms and metals. Secondly, would not be better to separate and discussed in this section organic from inorganic compounds? Besides, phenols could also be toxic and the references from 2016 should be including bout these topics. 8) But Zn is different from Cu. Is it not copper inducing Fenton reactions? It is not a contradiction that "can inhibit formation of free radicals and the development of oxidative stress due to their scavenger properties"? It is known that although they are both transition metals, Zn as anon-redox chemistry, and they have different metallomics. Please insert a recent reference about the biochemistry and medicinal applications and diseases associated with these metals. 9) What was the dosis of STZ used? There are several discussions, and also an old discussion, a

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes
ESPS manuscript NO: 31065
Title: Effect of medicinal mushrooms on blood cells under conditions of diabetes mellitus
Reviewer's code: 00227350
Reviewer's country: Trinidad and Tobago
Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song
Date sent for review: 2016-10-31 17:10
Date reviewed: 2017-01-10 07:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good work and authors would have discussed with some results Unnecessary references can be deleted

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes
ESPS manuscript NO: 31065
Title: Effect of medicinal mushrooms on blood cells under conditions of diabetes mellitus
Reviewer's code: 02446524
Reviewer's country: India
Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song
Date sent for review: 2016-10-31 17:10
Date reviewed: 2017-01-11 19:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nice.

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes
ESPS manuscript NO: 31065
Title: Effect of medicinal mushrooms on blood cells under conditions of diabetes mellitus
Reviewer's code: 02451558
Reviewer's country: China
Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song
Date sent for review: 2016-10-31 17:10
Date reviewed: 2016-11-14 21:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review is designed and written well. It is very interesting. It can be considered for publication after a few minor revisions are resolved. 1. Abstract The emphasis is not obvious. Please revise it. 2. INTRODUCTION It is too verbose and can be reduced. 3. CONCLUSIONS They are too much and should be simplified.