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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This chapter addresses an important topic for the scientific and medical community. By showing that Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus is not a single homogeneous disease but can be divided into four subtypes, the authors highlight the potential for more personalized and precise patient care. The discussion is timely, as clinicians increasingly recognize the need to move beyond the traditional one-size-fits-all approach. By bringing together findings from large cohorts in Europe, China, and cardiovascular outcome trials, this work provides a valuable reference point for both clinical practice and future research.****This is an important and timely contribution, and I encourage the authors to continue developing this line of work. The topic has strong potential to influence both research and clinical practice.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, the title is appropriate and reflects the core theme of the manuscript. If desired, it could be made slightly more specific, for example: “Is Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus One Disease? Subtype Classification and Clinical Implications.”****The current title is already clear and engaging. With only minor adjustments, it can attract even more attention from readers.** |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **The abstract is generally clear and well-structured. I suggest replacing the phrase “we believe” with a more neutral expression such as “this review summarizes.” Adding one short sentence about key clinical outcomes would also strengthen the abstract, for example that the insulin-deficient subtype (SIDD) carries the highest risk of microvascular complications, while the insulin-resistant subtype (SIRD) carries the greatest risk of kidney disease.****The abstract already provides a solid overview of the chapter. A few clarifications will make it even more impactful for readers.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | **Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound and supported by appropriate references. A few minor improvements are recommended:*** **Ensure consistency in reporting the sample size of the DEVOTE trial (7,637 vs 7,546 in different sections).**
* **Use one consistent labelling system for the subtypes, e.g. Cluster A (SIDD), Cluster B (SIRD), Cluster C (MOD), and Cluster D (MARD).**
* **Standardize terminology: use *GLP-1 RA* instead of “GLP1-RAG,” and *MASLD (metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease)*.**
* **Consider summarizing the repeated subtype definitions in a single table to avoid redundancy.**

**The manuscript is built on a strong scientific foundation. These small refinements will further enhance the clarity and clinical usefulness of the work.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **The references are generally sufficient and up-to-date, covering studies up to 2024. Some small corrections are needed:*** **Ensure consistent spelling of “Ahlqvist” (sometimes written as “Ahlquist”).**
* **Complete the missing DOI in one of the Nutrients references.**

**The reference list is already extensive and up to date. Correcting minor details will make it even more reliable for readers who want to explore the topic further.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The overall quality of English is adequate for scholarly communication. Minor refinements would make it stronger:* Use an impersonal tone instead of first-person expressions (“we believe,” “we exclude”).
* Shorten long paragraphs where possible.
* Improve consistency of medical terms (HbA1c, eGFR, GLP-1 RA, SGLT2i).

The writing is clear and accessible. With a few stylistic adjustments, the flow will become even smoother and more reader-friendly. |  |
| Optional/General comments | I truly appreciate the effort the authors have put into synthesizing evidence from diverse populations. With the minor clarifications suggested, this chapter will make a very meaningful contribution to the field. |  |
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| **PART 2:**  |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | No ethical issues were identified. The chapter is a narrative review based on published literature, and it respects academic standards.The chapter reflects careful academic writing and adherence to ethical standards. |  |
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