

Revision Report

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled **“Exposure to proton pump inhibitors and risk of diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis” (ID: 81855)**. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper.

Response to reviewer comments

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Gist/summary: Exposure to Protein Pump Inhibitors (PPI) increases Diabetes or serves as a primer for Diabetes Type 1. As rightly pointed out by authors, there are contradicting studies to check this which would have been a bias. I am in awe with the analysis the author have ventured upon While the list of participants have been with ca. 800k+, the number of studies and hit that the author spotted down from Meta analyses is very few in numbers, and yet they could manage the metadata from such larger participants. There could be a pictorial methodology with mention of participants in Figure 1 Pl correct heterogenous spelling Pl expand RCT PL mention as PRISMA guidelines. whence searches, did the authors use eoperands, AND, OR, NOT. The word PPI mere might be different as it may pertain to Protein Protein Interactions the conclusions may be expanded Scores on a scale of 0-5 with 5 being the best Language: 4.5 Novelty: 4 Brevity: 4 Scope and relevance: 4

COMMENT# 1

There could be a pictorial methodology with mention of participants in Figure 1.

Response 1: Thank you for your comments and we fully agree with you. We have added description of participants in “Figure 1”, as shown in Page 15.

COMMENT# 2

Pl correct heterogenous spelling

Response 2: Thank you very much for this helpful suggestion. We have corrected this mistake in all of this article. (Page 2)

COMMENT# 3

Pl expand RCT

Response 3: Thank you for your comments and we fully agree with you. We have expanded RCT in our article. (Page 3, 4, 8)

COMMENT# 4

PL mention as PRISMA guidelines.

Response 4: Thank you for your comments and we fully agree with you. This meta-analysis was conducted according to the standard Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA), and the relevant references are quoted and listed in the paper, as shown in reference 14. (Page 10)

COMMENT# 5

Whence searches, did the authors use eoperands, AND, OR, NOT. The word PPI mere might be different as it may pertain to Protein Protein Interactions.

Response 5: Thank you for your comments. Firstly, we used "and" and "or" to combine subject and free terms to form a logical search, as shown in the supplementary material. Secondly, as you say, the word PPI may be different, but for the sake of comprehensiveness of the search, we did not use "Not" to exclude studies that did not match, but rather a subsequent exclusion by manual screening by both authors. We really thank you for raising that.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors proposed that the use of PPIs is related to an increased risk of diabetes. However, the manuscript requires a revision. 1. The ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS should be removed, 2. In COCLUSION; please provides more content in this section.

COMMENT# 1

The ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS should be removed.

Response 1: Your comment is valuable. The ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS in our manuscript have been removed.

COMMENT# 2

In COCLUSION; please provides more content in this section.

Response 2: Thank you for pointing out this issue. We indeed should provide more content in this section. In our revised manuscript, we worked a lot on the conclusion part. And we hope that the conclusion now will be improved and meet with your approval. (Page 2, 8)

Response to editorial comments

Editorial Comments:

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it' s ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Diabetes, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Please authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response to editor:

Thank you very much for your kind interest in our manuscript. According to your comments, we amended the relevant part in our modified manuscript. Some of your questions were answered below:

1. The issues raised in the peer-review report have been resolved.
2. We have arranged the figures using PowerPoint, and the original figure documents are uploaded to

the revision files, which submit as “81855-Image File.ppt” on the system.

3. Table files were provided as standard three-line tables, which submit as “81855-Table File” on the system.

4. The “Article Highlights” section has been added in our modified manuscript at the end of the main text.