

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/amj-20-147>

Reviewer #1

The authors aimed to deliver an overview of cardiac biomarkers in T2DM. The figures are appealing and informative.

Comment 1: Unfortunately, the English quality is poor (grammar, the way of formulation, forgotten articles...). The ratio between the text and the number of citations is unusual. The manuscript reads like a concertation of conclusions trying to bestride a very wide issue-area using too less space. Different to an original article (which determines its quality mostly by its profound methods, clear results and a good discussion), a review defines its quality by the structured (re)appraisal of a certain topic, which I am missing. I am sorry but I cannot recommend the manuscript with a clear conscience.

Reply: Thank you for your comment. More commentaries in certain issues for biomarkers have added and discussed.

Several grammar/formulation issues:

Page 2 before citation 10,11: do you mean “natural evolution”? Same thing on page 3

Page 3: ...adaptive molecular mechanisms of maintain of CV.. Do you mean maintaining?

Page 4 ...NT-proBNP plasma levels in T2DM patiwns with HFrEF and HFpEF... you mean patients

Page 5: ...E/Em ratio, these relationships were no exist after adjustment... I guess you mean “these relationships did not exist” or “ these relationships were non-existent”

Page 5: the word “prognostication” is very unusual, why not using prognosis

Page 6: accompanied *by*

Page 6: It has been reported that circulating levels of GDF-15 > 3812 pg/ml *are* clearly indicative for T2DM among patients without established CV disease

Page 6: ... predicted newly diagnosed T2DM and *positively respond* to metformin

Page 6: ... found to be predictive or to be a predictor

Reply: Authors thank the reviewer for comments. The English grammar and errors were checked, corrected, and highlighted by yellow in the main text of the paper.

Reviewer #2

The authors present a narrative review in the important field of "diabetes and cardiovascular biomarkers". The manuscript is informative and interesting to read.

Comment 1: Unfortunately, in my opinion, there is no prospect of future clinical applications of the biomarkers. (for example, whether there are biomarkers that could be used for clinical follow-up after a cardiovascular event).

Reply: the section “Future perspectives” has added at the end of the manuscript

Comment 2: I also think that a paragraph on biomarkers related to cardiovascular rehabilitation, exercise or lifestyle modification would be an important addition.

Reply: the paragraph on biomarkers related to cardiovascular rehabilitation, exercise or lifestyle modification has written and incorporated in the text of the paper