



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 94861

Title: Effect of SPTL Y on Type 2 diabetes mellitus

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 04245957

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PharmD, PhD, Academic Research, Emeritus Professor, Senior
Researcher

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Spain

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-03-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Editor

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-04-02 08:32

Reviewer performed review: 2024-04-02 15:28

Review time: 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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

I consider it to be a very good study carried out with appropriate methodology. Its results and conclusions are precise and interesting. Since a multitude of acronyms/abbreviations appear in the text, I would advise that: A) the complete name be written down the first time they are mentioned (in some cases this is not done, B) a list of abbreviations be included. It would be useful for those not well versed in the subject.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

Manuscript NO: 94861

Title: Effect of SPTL Y on Type 2 diabetes mellitus

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 08178164

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Md

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: United States

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-03-26

Reviewer chosen by: Shang Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-08-19 18:32

Reviewer performed review: 2024-08-19 19:43

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input 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 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

I would like to commend the authors for their exceptional manuscript. The quality of the work is outstanding, and I thoroughly enjoyed reading it. The manuscript offers valuable scientific insights that were previously unknown to me. However, I have a few recommendations for improving the clarity and presentation of the paper: 1. Tables and Figures Placement: To enhance readability, I suggest relocating the tables and figures to the Materials and Methods section. This adjustment would alleviate the need for readers to navigate to the end of the paper to refer to these elements, thus improving the overall flow of the text. 2. Rephrasing for Clarity: On page 10, lines 3-5, the sentence "Proband's mother, sister, and son were also confirmed carrying this mutation by Sanger sequencing, which was not found in his wife and father" could benefit from rewording. I recommend revising it to: "Proband's mother, sister, and son were confirmed to carry this mutation by Sanger sequencing. However, his wife and father do not carry this mutation." 3. Variety in Language: The manuscript frequently uses the term "however." To enhance readability, consider varying the language with alternatives such as "but," "still," "nonetheless," or "nevertheless." For example, on page 14, line 20, where it reads



**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

"however, in vitro experiments showed the pro-apoptosis," the word "still" could be a suitable substitute. 4. Terminology Correction: On page 15, lines 1-2, the term "uncooperation" is incorrect. It would be more accurate to rephrase this as: "Secondly, due to a lack of cooperation from some members of this family, genetic testing was not performed." 5. Redundant Adverbs: On page 15, line 7, the phrase "But nevertheless, current literatures" uses both "but" and "nevertheless," which is redundant. I recommend using only one of these adverbs for clarity. I hope these suggestions are helpful. The manuscript is well-executed, and these revisions should enhance its overall readability and precision.