Aug 3rd, 2021

Baishideng Publishing Group Inc.

Dear Editors,

Thanks for your decision letter on July 8th, 20121, in which you suggest us to revise our manuscript (NO. 67216), entitled "Genome-wide association study reveals novel loci for adult type I diabetes in a 5-year nested case-control study", for a minor revision.

Here we submit the revised version of this article with highlight changes and the corresponding response to editor's comments and suggestions.

We would like to thank for the valuable comments and recommendations from the editor and reviewers, which could greatly improve the quality of our present article. And we hope that our responses could satisfy they very well.

Best regards,

Zengli Zhang, Ph. D.

Response to the reviewers' comments and suggestions on NO. 67216 submitted to World Journal of Diabetes by Gao *et al.*

Reviewer 1: I want to thank the authors for conducting this important study. Genetic understanding is an integral part of the management of T1D. The manuscript is comprehensive, with adequate details in all sections.
Response: Thanks for the reviewers' kind and encouraging comment. And we will try our best to answer reviewers' valuable questions.

Reviewer 1: I have minor suggestions for the authors to improve the quality of this manuscript: The English language needs to be improved. I have found some sentence structuring and grammar issues that should be solved (with the help of a native English speaker preferably). One example is "were shown as figure 1" should be written as "is shown in figure 1" in the methods section heading 2.2. In the same heading, "were random selected" should be "were randomly selected". Likewise, there are many issues concerning the English language which require refinement. SNP must be written in the full form for the first time in the abstract.
Response: Thanks for pointing out this problem for us. We have revised this terrible grammatical mistake in our article, with the help of a native English Speaker. Please see.

Reviewer 1: The introduction is adequately addressed, pointing out the gaps in the literature (lack of larger studies with decreased risk of sampling bias) in addition to appropriately introducing the research question. However, providing some facts can strengthen the introduction, such as the prevalence of T1D, global health care cost, direct and indirect mortality rates.
Response: Thanks for these valuable recommendations. We have added the prevalence of T1D and the mortality rate of T1D into the introduction part. But we did not find the corresponding data of globe T1D health care cost from the previous studies. Please see.