

Review of: "Does Sugar Control Arrest Complications in Type 2 Diabetes? Examining the Rigour in Statistical Methods and Causal Inference in Clinical Trials."

Minaxi Saini

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is very needful, raising a very important clinical issue. The article also challenges current clinical practice and addresses the need for re-evaluating the clinical guidelines for patients with type 2 diabetes. The suggestions given in the study for the diabetes trials can also be implemented in other clinical trials to improve the quality of the trials. I appreciate the writing skills of the author as well. However, the study needs certain modifications to match the standard of a scientific paper:

1. If the study had been structured, it would have been more understandable.
2. The study seems like a narrative review. Many facts are mentioned but not described like a scientific paper; for example, "out of 341 outcomes compared between intensive and conventional control groups, in 38 pairs, the frequency of adverse outcomes is individually significantly lower than the control, and in 26, it is individually significantly higher." This sentence needs to be elaborated for better understanding, like whether these outcomes were microvascular or macrovascular complications (categorization of complications), the meaning of "intensive," etc.

"if soft, subjective, and surrogate endpoints are removed, no difference in the number of beneficial and harmful results remains." This sentence also needs modification and description. The word "soft" does not seem scientific.

"If the Bonferroni principle or any other correction for the significance level is applied, none of the effects of the treatment turns out to be significant".... The sentence needs a more descriptive (data-based) explanation.
3. The abbreviations must be elaborated when they appear first in the text (2nd last line of the 2nd paragraph).
4. The inclusion of a flow chart for the study selection might have been more understandable.
5. Please specify which databases have been searched for the study selection.
6. The summation used in the study is not **reproducible**. The authors have not given any details of the software or the process of summation (not even in the supplementary file).
7. How can the odds ratio be combined if the incidence of macrovascular and microvascular complications is different? Please describe.

