



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Experimental Medicine*

**Manuscript NO:** 95272

**Title:** Dapagliflozin as an oral Antihyperglycemic Agent in the Management of Diabetes Mellitus in patients with liver cirrhosis

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05136305

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Full Professor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-04-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Fei Wei

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-07-19 09:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-07-19 13:32

**Review time:** 4 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

Dear authors, This is an important study and it has revealed significant results. However, there are still some comments: 1. Similarity Index: The similarity index is reported at 30%, which is considered high. The authors should review the manuscript for potential plagiarism and ensure that all sources are properly cited and paraphrased where necessary. 2. IRB Approval: While the authors have attached the IRB approval, they did not state its number in the methodology. Including the IRB approval number is crucial for transparency and ethical compliance. This should be added to the methodology section. 3. Safety Reporting: The authors claim that dapagliflozin is safe but did not provide any literature on its safety concerning liver and heart functions. Additionally, they did not estimate liver enzymes, which is a significant omission given the patient population with cirrhosis. This weakens the claim of safety. Although: 3.1. Urinary infection was mentioned in the results of thi swork , it was not included in the final



**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

conclusion. and 3.2. It is common adverse reactions by "dapagliflozin " of include female genital mycotic infections, nasopharyngitis, and urinary tract infections. This omission could be perceived as biased and should be addressed for a balanced conclusion. 4. Sample Size: The study included 300 patients (100 on insulin and 200 on dapagliflozin), which seems reasonable. However, the justification for this sample size should be provided to ensure it is statistically adequate for the outcomes measured. 5. Delay in Publication: The study was conducted in 2022, yet it has not been published. The reasons for this delay should be addressed. It might raise concerns about the study's validity or findings. 6. Comparative Safety: The actions stated in the abstract are not sufficient to judge that dapagliflozin and its doses are safer than insulin treatment for these patients. More comprehensive data on safety, including liver enzyme levels and heart function, are needed. 7. Lack of Limitations: No limitations were stated in the study. Every study has limitations, and acknowledging them is important for understanding the context and generalizability of the findings. The authors should include a section on limitations. 8. Authors have to state the novelty of their work despite that this medicine "dapagliflozin" has been approved by FDA since 2014 9. No references were cited in 2024. It is important to cite recent references to ensure the study is up-to-date with the latest research and developments in the field. Recommendations: Based on the current state of the work, it is recommended that the manuscript should be revised to address the above points before considering it for publication. This will enhance the study's credibility and ensure it provides a comprehensive and balanced view of the safety and efficacy of dapagliflozin in this patient population.