

To,
The Editor In Chief,
World Journal of Diabetes

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to revise the manuscript. We are pleased to know that the reviewers have found our manuscript well summarized and significant enough for publication. We have substantially revised the manuscript according to the peer-review report. Our point-wise response to reviewer's comments is enclosed along with the revised manuscript. In addition, we have revised the manuscript according to the editorial office's comments, we hope the revised manuscript fulfills all the publishing requirements of the journal, and the reviewer's and the journal find our revision satisfactory and acceptable.

In response to the issues raised by the editorial office:

- We have used self-citations pertinent to the topic of our manuscript, and the self-referencing rates are less than 10%. Thus, it is according to the format of the manuscript.
- We have uploaded the grant approval document from the funding agency.
- We have arranged all the 4 figures in PowerPoint format, and uploaded the same. Figure number 1 and 2 are self made, so we have provided the original editable figures, figure 3 and figure 4 are taken from already published work, for that we have provided the required documents for re-using these two figures in our manuscript. In addition to this, we have cited the reference sources in the reference list.

Response to reviewers' comments

We thank both of the reviewers for finding our manuscript well summarized and significant. Besides, both of the reviewers have some comments and suggestions. We have considerably revised our manuscript to address these concerns and add their thoughtful suggestions. In addition, we have revised the title to make it more specific as per the suggestion. We hope that the reviewers will find our revision satisfactory and acceptable.

Our point-by-point responses to reviewers' comments are as follows:

Reviewer #1

Comment: Renal gluconeogenesis in insulin resistance is well summarized in this review article. However, in figure 3, the difference between the IR-siRNA group and the control group cannot be judged, and it is suggested to mark clearly.

Response: Thank you for your comments and suggestion. We apologize for the unintended mistake made at our end; the figure has been cited at wrong place in the text. The figure has been added to show that the IR silencing attenuated the insulin's inhibitory effect on cAMP/DEXA-induced gluconeogenesis in human primary proximal tubule cells (hPT). In the revised version we have cited the figure at the correct place in the text.

Reviewer #2:

Comment: I suggest the author to make the title more interesting, by adding the specific focus of the article. For example--> Renal Gluconeogenesis in Insulin Resistance and Diabetes: the post-absorptive phase's culprit. The authors should describe the management of this condition too, particularly in clinical settings.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion, accordingly we have revised manuscript version. The revised title read as "Renal Gluconeogenesis in Insulin Resistance: a culprit for hyperglycemia in Diabetes.", also as per the suggestion we have added a paragraph describing the clinical management of the condition before the conclusion section.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Diabetes

Manuscript NO: 64176

Title:Renal Gluconeogenesis in Insulin Resistance: a culprit for hyperglycemia in Diabetes

Reviewer's code:02444752

Position:Editorial Board

Academic degree:PhD

Professional title:Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory:India

Manuscript submission date:2021-02-16

Reviewer chosen by:Han Zhang (Part-Time Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-29 23:55

Reviewer performed review:2021-03-30 01:21

Review time:1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Grade B: Verygood[] Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair[] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Prioritypublishing[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Grade B: Minor languagepolishing[] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing[] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority)[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Accept(General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision[] Major revision[] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review:[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous[] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest:[] Yes[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

“Figure 3. siRNA mediated knockout ...” should be changed to “Figure 3. siRNA mediated knockdown...”

Response : As per the suggestion we have changed the word knockout to knockdown in the figure 3.