

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 40441

Title: Retrospective review of efficacy of anagliptin as compared to linagliptin on metabolic parameters over 2 years of drug consumption

Reviewer's code: 00503221

Reviewer's country: Israel

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-06-25

Date reviewed: 2018-06-26

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript on the Efficacy of anagliptin and linagliptin on metabolic parameters in the long-term management of type 2 diabetes: A comparative cohort study, does not contain new significant data or conclusion.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ Y No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ Y No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 40441

Title: Retrospective review of efficacy of anagliptin as compared to linagliptin on metabolic parameters over 2 years of drug consumption

Reviewer's code: 00506397

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-06-25

Date reviewed: 2018-06-26

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Hamasaki and Hamasaki report the results of a 2-year retrospective study that was aimed at assessing the comparative effectiveness of anagliptin and linagliptin on the glycemic control, blood pressure, lipid profile, and liver and renal function in Japanese

patients with T2D. Based on the data from 234 patients (anagliptin group, 117 patients; linagliptin group, 117 patients), the authors report that although both DPP-4 inhibitors had a salutary effect on glycemic control at 3, 6, 12, and 24 months, their clinical outcomes were not identical. While anagliptin treatment led to reduced diastolic blood pressure and total serum cholesterol, patients treated with linagliptin had increased HDL-cholesterol levels and reduced urinary albumin-creatinine ratio (UACR). Apparently, linagliptin also improved liver function. Based on these analyses, the authors suggested that anagliptin and linagliptin may be clinically differentiated with respect to their ability to affect blood pressure, lipid profile, and liver function. Although his suggestion is consistent with their overall findings of this rather preliminary study, the manuscript will benefit from making following changes to improve the presentation of these data: 1. In the Core tip the authors should explicitly point out that this study suffers from two limitations: First, for a retrospective study, this has rather small number of patients. Second caveat should be included with regard to a relatively short duration of patient follow-up. 2. The authors need to articulate more clearly their concluding statements at the end of Discussion: "This study supports the hypothesis that there could be a drug-specific effect of DPP-4 inhibitors on metabolic parameters beyond their class effect. Thus, we cannot describe the utility of these drugs in clinical practice separately. However, a multicenter, randomized, open-label, parallel-group trial has been conducted previously to assess the comparative effectiveness of anagliptin and sitagliptin on LDL-C in patients with T2D and atherosclerosis [27]. Nevertheless, further investigations are warranted to validate the findings of this study." What were the findings of the multicenter, randomized, open-label, parallel-group Trial mentioned in Reference #27? Do these data support authors' conclusions based on the present study or not? If not, how was that study related to the overall design of the current study? 3. Under Medical History Recording, the sentence "In addition, we confirmed the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

medication adherence of study patients' at every medical examination." There is no need to put an apostrophe after patients. 4. The data presented in Figure 1 and 2 are redundant. This information is already contained in Table 3. Both Figures should be removed and additional information contained in both Figures may be articulated in words in the Text.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ Y No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ Y No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 40441

Title: Retrospective review of efficacy of anagliptin as compared to linagliptin on metabolic parameters over 2 years of drug consumption

Reviewer's code: 02913340

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-06-25

Date reviewed: 2018-06-30

Review time: 5 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overview of the study This study evaluates the comparative effectiveness of anagliptin and linagliptin on the glycemic control, blood pressure, lipid profile, and liver and renal function in Japanese patients with T2DM. As per my pubmed review the comparison of



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

Anagliptin and linagliptin is not available before, representing novel work. Though the study is retrospective in nature, but it has potential to guide a good RCT in future. Limitations as inherent to retrospective study are there, but still authors have managed to present the data in a systematic manner. I find discussion a bit lengthy which authors can consider to shorten it and manuscript a bit unstructured especially results section and abstract, which I think should be done to improve the presentation of manuscript. Introduction and methods section are well written. Major revisions 1. Abstract needs to be structured. Kindly see instructions for observational study. 2. Important findings can be objectively shown as in numbers like A1C, BP, Lipids 3. Results should be structured. Para 1 should contain the baseline characteristics and demographics of enrolled patients. Para 2 should contain the important/number of changes made to the prescription in terms of drugs for glucose control, lipid and blood pressure medications. Para 3,4,5 should contain details separately for glucose parameters, blood pressure and lipid parameters respectively. Objective data can be included rather than straight statements. Para 6 should contain remaining information. 4. Most important is that results have been compared from baseline to end of study period, whereas study was to compare the effectiveness of 2 drugs. Therefore change in 2 arms should be compared separately after adjusting for baseline parameters. 5. Data should be presented in SI units 6. Flow of discussion is not smooth. I will suggest that most of the discussion should focus on the differences between two drugs rather than on GLP-1 or other DPP-4 inhibitors. Discussion should be streamlined so that one parameter is discussed followed by other and so on, and should not be intermingled like discussion on blood pressure followed by lipid and then back to blood pressure. It should be shortened a bit. 7. Another major limitation is ensuring compliance and adjustment of medication changes in between. Minor 1. Title needs revision. Can be made as "A retrospective review of efficacy of anagliptin as compared to linagliptin on metabolic



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

parameters over 2 years of drug consumption” Wording can still be changed by authors so that title reflects what has been there in manuscript. 2. Type 2 diabetes [T2D] should be replaced by Type 2 diabetes mellitus [T2DM] 3. Under study design: Where Hamasaki Clinic is mentioned [Page 5, Line 2], kindly add whether it is either primary care clinic or tackles patients who have been referred.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ Y No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ Y No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 40441

Title: Retrospective review of efficacy of anagliptin as compared to linagliptin on metabolic parameters over 2 years of drug consumption

Reviewer's code: 00503221

Reviewer's country: Israel

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-08-07

Date reviewed: 2018-08-07

Review time: 8 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I'm satisfy with the improvement and the corrections.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 40441

Title: Retrospective review of efficacy of anagliptin as compared to linagliptin on metabolic parameters over 2 years of drug consumption

Reviewer's code: 00506397

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-08-07

Date reviewed: 2018-08-07

Review time: 8 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have done a commendable job of revising their manuscript. Their revised manuscript has been greatly improved by incorporation of appropriate responses to the critiques/concern raised by me. This should be published as a priority,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No