

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 90171

Title: Effect of special types of bread with select herbal components on postprandial glucose levels in diabetic patients

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Associate, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: Serbia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-26 14:58

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-26 15:12

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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.

Thank to the reviewer for his time, professional review of our work and for the errors pointed out. Here are our answers:

ANSWER:The latest literature (30-35) from 2019 to 2024 was added to the manuscript in the reference section.

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?

ANSWER: The latest literature supports and agrees with our obtained results and supports our findings that certain plant components that were added during the preparation of bread, lower postprandial glucose in T2DM patients. In the discussion,

the authors tried to give possible explanations based mainly on physiological and biochemical facts.

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.

ANSWER: 3. And 4. Thank you for pointing out the error that we also found during a detailed review of the text. The results were reanalyzed and written in accordance with the data presented in the graphs. A new conclusion was written, which is fully supported by the facts presented in the 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.

ANSWER: The addition of the latest literature in the discussion section fully supports the facts that we presented in the previous text.

6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

ANSWER: Thank you for pointing out the mistakes that we made writing the paper. The manuscript was carefully reviewed again and all the listed irregularities were eliminated.

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.

ANSWER: According to your recommendation and the recommendation of the editor, the paper was sent to the professional editorial office (AJE) for correction of the English language, and the certificate is attached with other supporting documents.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 90171

Title: Effect of special types of bread with select herbal components on postprandial glucose levels in diabetic patients

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05376168

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Serbia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-03 00:49

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-12 08:29

Review time: 9 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, Drasko M Gostiljac et al showed that special types of bread (STB) had better effects than rye bread on postprandial glucoregulation in T2DM patients and had better organoleptic and satiety characteristics than rye bread. This manuscript has a clear and distinct structure. However, there are some issues that the authors should address to improve the quality of the manuscript. 1.The study enrolled 97 T2DM patients and 16 healthy subjects. In Figure 2, the authors compared T2DM patients and healthy subjects. In Figure 3, the authors compared the whole subjects. In Figure 4, the authors compared T2DM patients with oral antidiabetic therapy and insulin therapy. While in Table 2, the authors only provided the basic characteristics of whole patients without comparison of these subgroups. So the manuscript lacks rigor and does not support the conclusion enough. Please add supplement analysis.

ANSWER: Thank to the reviewer for the time and professional help that contributed to the finalization of this manuscript.

Since this was a randomized study, the main aspect was the effect of the new bread with plant ingredients compared to the rye bread, primarily within the investigated

groups. Your proposal is understandable, but comparing the basic characteristics of the patients with our obtained results would only complicate the interpretation and analysis of the data. Thanks for pointing out the error. The presented results were analyzed again, the results were refined and a new conclusion was written.

2.The authors should add some of the latest studies to support the current study.

ANSWER: In the discussion section, the latest references in the last 5 years ending with 2024 have been added, references (30-35).

3.Please check for typos and punctuation throughout the manuscript, e.g type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (DMT2) should be changed to type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM).

ANSWER: Thank you for pointing out the errors. The entire manuscript was again carefully reviewed, errors were corrected. Text containing the names diabetes mellitus type 2 (DMT2) is changed to diabetes mellitus type 2 (T2DM). The manuscript was sent for correction of the English language and received an official certificate