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Specific Comments to Authors

This review article is well written and discusses clinically important topics. The main problem is related to language editing and grammar corrections. 1. All the paragraphs written in yellow-orange color should be checked by a native English speaker. Other paragraphs written in black color could be reduced. The shorter the better. 2. The abstract contains this abbreviation: SGLTis. The full name should be written first. The title contains some words written in uppercase and others in lowercase. Please use one format. Also, in the abstract and core tip, what is primary prevention of atherosclerosis? Is it a new heart disease? 3. In the abstract and core tip, it is better to change and correct this sentence: In this paper, we concentrate on upgrading clinical research of SGLTis for patients with type 2... Updating is better than upgrading in this context. 4. In the background section, please correct the grammar and language errors in this sentence: The use scenarios, which are supported by clear evidence-based medical evidence and recommended by authoritative guidelines, will not be included in this review. 5. In the main conclusions of all tables, please try to reduce the contents. Also, magazine can be changed to journal. The conclusion related to Ferreira JP [18], please correct these
sentence: Empagliflozin reduced the primary outcome not significantly different between mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists nonusers and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists users. Also the conclusion related to Voors AA [26]. Please correct this sentence: Empagliflozin is well tolerated and results in significant clinical benefit in patients hospitalized for AHF in the 90 days after starting treatment. Also, related to CarvalhoPEP[31], please correct this conclusion:SGLT2i addition to conventional diuretic therapy reduced all-cause death, readmissions for HF, and the composite of cardiovascular death or readmissions for HF. 6- Some words in the titles of tables are written in Bold. why? 7-Under limitation heading, please rewrite this sentence: According to our review, these materials we enrolled, most studies are subgroup or meta-analyses. There is lacking well-designed, large sample size, and long follow-up studies directly target to these diseases
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
General Comments: The manuscript provides an extensive review of clinical trials and meta-analyses related to the efficacy and safety of SGLT inhibitors (SGLTis) in managing various cardiovascular conditions in patients with type 2 diabetes. It offers a thorough overview, integrating data from multiple studies to support the utilization of SGLTis in clinical practice. Specific Comments: Aim: The aim is clearly defined, providing a concise statement of the research focus. However, the scope could be broadened to explicitly state the intention to evaluate the nonglycemic benefits of SGLTis. Methodology: The methodology section is adequately detailed, yet it could benefit from including specific inclusion and exclusion criteria for the studies reviewed. Results: Results are well-summarized, presenting a balanced view of the current evidence. Nevertheless, it is crucial to address potential publication bias in the studies reviewed, and if possible, to provide quantitative data to support the qualitative synthesis. Conclusion: The conclusion is well-articulated, highlighting the importance of the findings and suggesting avenues for future research. It might be helpful to comment on the clinical significance of the results for patient care. Limitations: The discussion on limitations is
transparent, which is commendable. It is suggested to also consider limitations related to the diversity of patient populations and the generalizability of the results. Writing Style: The manuscript is mostly well-written but could benefit from careful proofreading to correct minor typographical errors.