



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 100801

**Title:** Improving Nursing Care Protocols for Diabetic Patients Through a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Recent Years

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02627243

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Poland

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-08-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Shang Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-10-03 09:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-10-03 10:25

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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, Your paper is very interesting and clearly practical. In the Introduction you painted a picture of a global pandemic of diabetes and on the important role of nursing care improving self-care and the quality of life of patients with type 2 diabetes. Then you performed a detailed systematic review and meta-analysis of a number of papers regarding nursing care of patients with diabetes. You discussed all of them very thoroughly. Although you found discrepancies and heterogeneity of the results, the overall effect was beneficial. You found an improvement in both glycemic parameters: in glycated hemoglobin A1c and in fasting plasma glucose. It was a huge work and I can congratulate you on the work you have done. I also congratulate you on your creativity in creating an algorithm for nursing care depending on the skills of the patients. This scheme looks very practical and – in my opinion – it can be easily introduced in everyday clinical practice, especially in diabetic outpatient clinics where diabetic nurses and/or educators are available. But it can be also applicable in general practitioners’ offices – in my country so-called coordinated care is introduced (among others in diabetology) and in such offices a diabetic nurse/educator is obligatory. However, I found also some



**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

minor issues to correct: 1. In the first use, you wrote "glycated" hemoglobin, which is the correct form, but later you used the term "glycosylated", which was withdrawn a several years ago, so please make corrections in the text 2. The term "Fasting blood glucose" is rather incorrect, because laboratories usually measure Fasting plasma glucose, so please correct this meaning 3. One of the paragraphs is written in Spanish (Catalan?), so please translate it to English. 4. Please check also the quality of the language, you can ask for help from a native speaker (if such a person works at your university) Sincerely,  
Reviewer



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 100801

**Title:** Improving Nursing Care Protocols for Diabetic Patients Through a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Recent Years

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03730300

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-08-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Shang Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-10-02 04:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-10-05 08:24

**Review time:** 3 Days and 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I appreciate you giving me a chance to review your valuable manuscript. You integrated the previous studies systemically and analyzed them precisely. You provide a comprehensive understanding of the ideal nursing interventions for patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. I have some comments on your manuscript. I hope those will improve it significantly. 1. The clarity and simplicity of your manuscript's English writing are not just crucial for its understanding and impact, but they also significantly enhance the reader's ability to engage with the content. I believe this area should be a focus for improvement to ensure the manuscript's full potential is realized. 2. The integration of only nine articles into your meta-analysis may be a limitation of your manuscript. However, by adding more articles, you can significantly enhance the depth and breadth of your analysis, thereby strengthening your manuscript. 3. The edit issue has made all figures and tables hard to read, which is a significant concern. It's crucial that these elements are improved and made more explicit, as they play a key role in conveying your findings effectively. 4. Integrating qualitative previous articles could significantly enhance the originality and depth of your manuscript. Ideally, you should



**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

add your qualitative integrative result to this manuscript to improve the originality. 5. I noticed a lack of adequate references in the introduction part. The quote, “Interventions that focus on patient empowerment, such as self-monitoring of glucose and the development of decision-making skills related to health, are fundamental for effective self-care,” should be supported by more comprehensive references. This will significantly strengthen your argument and enhance the credibility of your manuscript. 6. Your purpose is to provide nursing clinical guidelines from this review. However, your results only provided interventions that are already known to clinical nurses. As possible as you can, you should improve to make your manuscript newer than previous studies. For example, as previously mentioned, you could add qualitative integration results. 7. You did not define the keywords of your study. It is crucial to provide clear definitions of key terms such as self-care and self-management in your manuscript. This will help the reader understand the context and the relevance of your study. Please reconsider the necessity of adding any other definitions of keywords to your manuscript.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 100801

**Title:** Improving Nursing Care Protocols for Diabetic Patients Through a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Recent Years

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02627243

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Poland

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-08-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Xin-Liang Qu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-10-25 20:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-10-25 22:11

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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





<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<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, Thank you for making the corrections recommended by both reviewers. The language of the manuscript was easy understandable even in the primary version of the manuscript (with the exception of the paragraph written in Spanish ;-). However, you followed recommendations made by the reviewers and invited an experienced philologist and English teacher for checking the language of the manuscript and after corrections made by her, the language quality clearly improved and made the manuscript better understandable. You followed my recommendations and removed the previously used form "glycosylated" and replaced it by "glycated" hemoglobin A1c, which is currently used form. You also replaced the term "fasting blood glucose" with fasting plasma glucose which is currently used either in the literature as well as in the clinical guidelines. Finally you replaced text written in Spanish, by the text in English. Regarding quality and readability of figures and tables, I checked appropriate attached files and either figures as well as tables are clear and easy readable. In my opinion the choice of references was appropriate based on flow chart, and I had no remarks regarding this issue. I can also repeat that algorithm for nursing care created by you, which depends on the skills of the patients, looks very practical and – in my opinion – it





**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**

can be (or maybe should be) easy introduced in everyday clinical practice, especially in diabetic outpatient clinics where diabetic nurses and / or educators are available. But it can be also applicable in general practitioners' offices - for example in my country so-called coordinated care is introduced (among others also in diabetology) and in such offices a diabetic nurse or educator is obligatory. And from a practitioner point of view I found that algorithm as very useful. In summary, a corrections made by you improved substantially the quality of manuscript. I have no further remarks and - in my opinion - your work can be accepted in current form without further revisions. Sincerely,  
Reviewer #2