

Dear World Journal of Diabetes Editorial,

First of all, thank you for the possibility of consideration of our manuscript entitled: "Treatment approach to type 2 diabetes: past, present and future" for the publication if we response properly for the Editor and Reviewers comments and providing an English language editing service.

We revised our manuscript according to peer-reviewers' comments and the answer is listed below.

The answers to the Reviewers are listed below:

Reviewer 02823579

Comment: „good narrative of the treatment history of diabetes however bariatric surgery for the T2DM and BMI >35 should be mentioned, in accordance with ADA 2016 guidelines”

Answer: Thank you for the comment, we included the suggested data on the bariatric surgery. Hope we did it proper.

Reviewer 00597793

Comments: This is a fine review. My comments are mostly technical.

1. Title - I am not so sure that "future" developments in DM is correct. You do not discuss glucagon blockers, adiponectin agonists, and other such medications. You may want to stick to "Past & Present".

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We decided to keep the title but as you suggested in the last comment, we expanded the last section and discussed the future treatment options. We hope we did it proper.

2. Abstract "...has risen from biguanides.." you mean has "progressed from.."

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We revised the expression as you stated.

3. Core Tip - "Throw" is "through"..... The idea of aggressive reduction of glucose not leading to improved CVD mortality comes out of nowhere and does not fit well with everything you have said until now. The follow up ACCORD study showed reduced MIs with improved glycemic control. So you may wish to say that expansion of glucose lowering options has led to improvements in CVD but an exclusively glucose-centric approach to diabetes most likely will not lead to any further reductions in CVD mortality - or something like that.

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We revised the section as you stated.

4. History - "it was not recognized as a disease until 1812 when the NEJM was founded" - are you saying the first time DM was defined as a disease was in the NEJM or it was defined as disease in 1812? Clarify please.

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We revised the expression as you stated.

5. "This type of DM is phenotypically often accompanied by central OBESITY, ..."

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We revised the expression as you stated.

6. "...nature course of disease" should be "natural course of disease"

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We revised the expression as you stated.

7. Legend to Figure - "..which is why the metabolomics insulin effects" - I do not understand this. Rewrite.

8. In several places you write "till" - use "until"

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We revised the expression as you stated.

9. "...finally obtained by R DeFronzo.." - should be "described"

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We revised the expression as you stated.

10. The pharmacological treatment options...several years ago - actually it was 60 years ago!

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We revised the expression as you stated.

11. The section on future developments does not talk about future treatments. It is more a summary of the present. Either delete this section or actually discuss new approaches.

Answer: Thank you for the comment. Expanded the section discussing the treatment options in future. We hope we did it properly.

Sincerely,

Authors