

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 32775

Title: Eye and foot checks in patients with diabetes on haemodialysis: are they done, and who does them?

Reviewer's code: 00506380

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-01-23

Date reviewed: 2017-02-07

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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting topic. Consider titles for figures and less explanations. Not always easy to follow manuscript. Please spell out numbers less than 10. Start with positive findings on the results. Great idea about foot checks during dialysis. Watch using pronouns. Consider stronger conclusion and adding of the documentation you discussed. Consider improved interprofessional development as a way to help this issue.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 32775

Title: Eye and foot checks in patients with diabetes on haemodialysis: are they done, and who does them?

Reviewer's code: 02446566

Reviewer's country: Afghanistan

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-03-10

Date reviewed: 2017-03-17

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 checked="" 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 an interesting report on the quality of care of the diabetic patients with renal complications. Because the patients frequently attend dialysis, it is reasonable for them to have difficulty to go other clinics. However, the number of patients who had missed annual checkup of eye and foot was relatively small. To further reduce the number of these patients, it is a good idea to develop questionnaire that can be done during dialysis. In page 3 last line but one, "where" may be mistyping of "were".

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 32775

Title: Eye and foot checks in patients with diabetes on haemodialysis: are they done, and who does them?

Reviewer's code: 02446593

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-03-10

Date reviewed: 2017-03-29

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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

Mothojakan et al report the findings of a retrospective study of whether foot and eye screening is being done on diabetic patients undergoing hemodialysis. The paper has been revised in light of a previous review and is well written, easy to follow and without any obvious errors or unfounded claims. I think it is ready for publication.