

Answers to reviewers

Reviewer's comments:

Glucose Tolerance Test (OGTT) in children and adolescents" submitted to World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics. The study presents high quality and deals with important clinical issue, such type of study is needed. I have only few small remarks that authors should address properly. I recommend to accept the manuscript after minor revision. There are only some points to correct:

- please provide the list of abbreviations.

Answer: We thank the reviewer for the comments. The list of abbreviations has now been added.

- please provide the number of ethical approval.

Answer: The number of the ethical approval document has been added in the "Materials and Methods" section.

- introduction and discussion section need improvement.

Answer: We thank the reviewer for the comment. We believe that we have improved the introduction and the discussion by reducing the number of words and making the text more comprehensive.

- please provide information on how your results will translate into clinical practice

Answer: We thank the reviewer for the comment. Our study suggests that routine clinical practice could involve performing an OGTT in all children with overweight or obesity or in normal-weight children with a strong positive family history of T2DM, instead of a single fasting glucose measurement, in order to avoid missing the diagnosis of disorders of glucose metabolism. Also, a second OGTT may be necessary in children and adolescents with excessive weight who exhibit IFG or IGT in an initial OGTT in order to confirm the diagnosis. These have been added to the "Conclusion" section of the manuscript as the two last sentences.

- in discussion section please provide study strong points and study limitation section.

Answer: We thank the reviewer for the comment. We have provided strong points and study limitations in the "Discussion" section (highlighted in yellow).

- please correct typos

Answer: We thank the reviewer for the comment. We believe that we have corrected the typos.

- It would be also useful to illustrate some of the explained mechanisms as in general the manuscript is quite long and therefore a little bit difficult to follow.

Answer: We thank the reviewer for the comment. We have illustrated some of our findings using Tables 1 and 2 (highlighted in yellow in the "Results" section and have proposed some mechanisms in the discussion in paragraph 4, lines 6-11 (highlighted in yellow).

- Abstract should be shorter, more consistent and refer only to the main focus of the work.

Answer: We thank the reviewer for the comment. We have reduced the size of the abstract as much as possible, so that the Abstract Requirement of a minimum of 350 words, is met. The "Background" and "Aims" sections of the abstract have been shortened.

(1) *Science editor's comments:*

Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions.

Answer: We thank the editor for the comment. We have now added the Authors Contributions section, which is shown highlighted in yellow in the title page of the article.

(2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Answer: We thank the editor for the comment. We have now provided the original figure documents, as requested.

(3) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Answer: We thank the editor for the comment. The "Article Highlights" section has been added at the end of the main text (highlighted in yellow).