

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30123

**Title:** Type 2 diabetes in a Senegalese rural area

**Reviewer's code:** 02946508

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-14 17:47

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-03 12:48

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

This study is the first report in prevalence of diabetes in rural Senegal. Obesity, is evident risk of diabetes, caused by diet change due to urbanization. There remains necessary comments or analysis to upgrade the interpretation of the results. 1. As they pointed out in results, Line 221 "Variables concerning central obesity (WC and WHR) were no longer associated to FBG after adjustment for age, sex and education level (data not shown)." There seems no reason for not showing data, and comments in DISCUSSION is necessary. Is "central" obesity no longer important? 2. Line 276, as limitation, "glycaemic values on venous and capillary plasma are identical but that plasma measures are 11% higher than whole blood measures." This is true and known previous to starting investigation, therefore, sensitivity analysis or comments in underestimated range of prevalence is considered desirable if this difference really cause underestimation in the RESULTS. And/or, whether the comparison of prevalence between Tessekere and other region in DISCUSSION is based on the same or similar measure methods had better be commented. Minor comments 1. Define "controlled" and "not controlled" in figure. 2. Discussion is structurally discursive as follows: Line 231-261, there is only one paragraph Line 248, two facts are ambiguous. If first is true, please refer or



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

comment to previous study. And where is the second fact? Line 258 and Line262, two “Finally” is somewhat confusing.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30123

**Title:** Type 2 diabetes in a Senegalese rural area

**Reviewer's code:** 03494395

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-14 17:47

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-17 18:39

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

The introduction provides sufficient background and includes all relevant references. The research design is appropriate. The methods are adequately described. The results are clearly presented. The conclusions are supported by the results. I therefore recommend to accept this manuscript for publication.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30123

**Title:** Type 2 diabetes in a Senegalese rural area

**Reviewer's code:** 00160386

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-14 17:47

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-18 15:12

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 Duboz Priscilla et al report on the prevalence of diabetes in rural Senegalese population. I. Although reporting prevalence in a low economic background is important, There is evidence of published reports in rural Senegal.Quick google search shows a report as early as in 2012 giving an estimate of 4% in Senegal.Hence it is not correct to say that this is the first study.Such a statement to be deleted wherever it is stated. References: 1. Global estimates of the prevalence of diabetes for 2010 and 2030 in "Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice" 2012 2. Diabetes Burden in Urban and Rural Senegalese Populations in "Int Journal of endocrinology" 2015 II.The whole manuscript needs english and grammar corrections III. It is suggested to state that Identification of principle components with hypoglycemic effects is important in the traditional plants that the senagalese use.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30123

**Title:** Type 2 diabetes in a Senegalese rural area

**Reviewer's code:** 01408945

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-14 17:47

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-19 12:05

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 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		[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

Manuscript Number: 30123 Manuscript Title: Type 2 diabetes in a Senegalese rural area  
Corresponding Author: Duboz Priscilla et al. The reviewer's critiques are as follows. Major criticism: 1. Authors described as follows; The prevalence of diabetes is increasing rapidly, and it is expected that by 2040 there will be 34.2 million adults in sub-saharan Africa living with diabetes, more than double the number in 201 [2]. What is "201"? 2. The introduction section is too long. Authors should be shorter it. 3. Hemocue blood glucose analyzer that authors used is very unstable measurement. Why didn't authors use the blood glucose measurement? 4. Authors should measure HbA1c. Because it is very important factor to diagnose the diabetes mellitus. 5. Authors described almost ? had not attended school and the majority was not depressive. However, "?" is not suitable. 6. Authors described that 0 diabetic individuals had a FBG < 126 mg/dL (Figure 1). This expression is not suitable for medical manuscript. 7. In the conclusion section, authors should include only this study results and conclusions. When there are references in the conclusion section, it is not your study but others.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30123

**Title:** Type 2 diabetes in a Senegalese rural area

**Reviewer's code:** 00037668

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-14 17:47

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-22 00:02

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study investigates the incidence of T2DM in a Senegalese population in a rural area of the country. The population in question has historically been pastoral and with the changes in nutrition and in labor structure it is now undergoing a major social overhauling. The study appears to be properly conducted and written (for the most part). No major criticisms were noted. Minor: a. line 86: date is missing and the sentence starting after the period needs restructuring b. not clear if the comments (line 305 on) are from the authors or others and should probably be incorporated better in the body of discussion.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30123

**Title:** Type 2 diabetes in a Senegalese rural area

**Reviewer's code:** 00004982

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-14 17:47

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-23 15:05

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 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 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 authors examined the prevalence of diabetes in the rural population of Tessekere (Senegal) and to investigate the associated risk factors. The findings are interest, however, I have several concerns. 1. Authors should described information of diabetes in the present subjects in greater detail. Especially, author should add the HbA1c levels in the subjects. In addition, are all subjects type-2 diabetes in the present study? 2. The reviewer would like to know the characteristics of diabetes in a rural area in Senegal compared with other countries. 3. In table2, the authors examined odds Ratios for FBG  $\geq$  110 mg/dL and FBG  $\geq$  126 mg/dL by sex, age, and education level and body mass index in Tessekere. Why did the authors select the variables? 4. There are several typo-errors throughout the text: e.g. prevalences