Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hematology*

Manuscript NO: 82157

Title: ROLE OF HEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN THE PATHOGENESIS OF DIABETES MELLITUS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03721258
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: PhD
Professional title: Doctor
Reviewer's Country/Territory: China
Author's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-07 06:54

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-11 05:48

Review time: 3 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

this review article aims to report the relationship between these hematological parameters in the development of Diabetes Mellitus.good

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hematology*

Manuscript NO: 82157

Title: ROLE OF HEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN THE PATHOGENESIS OF DIABETES MELLITUS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04232981
Position: Editorial Board
Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD
Professional title: Assistant Professor
Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh
Author's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-07 19:07

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-18 01:55

Review time: 10 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic is of interest, and the manuscript is well illustrated. Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them? 3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.