

Answer to the reviewers

We have submitted a paper entitled “Does parity worsen diabetes-related chronic complications in women with type 1 diabetes?” for possible publication in this prestigious Journal.

Two reviewers have evaluated the manuscript that is a Retrospective Cohort Study with the number 23692.

Reviewer number 39368:

Dear Authors,

This manuscript aims to investigate the link between parity, glycemic control, cardiovascular risk factors and diabetes-related chronic complications in women who have Type 1 Diabetes. The results reveal no relationship between parity and glycemic control, hypertension, or chronic micro or macro vascular complications, yet a borderline effect on BMI, as defined by the authors.

The manuscript is well written, and the study results and evaluation means are well defined in detail. It provides additional information on a controversial area, while suitably mentioning the shortcomings of the study as well. It will be of good concern to clinicians/researchers working on this subject, while further research will still be needed for clarification of the mentioned links, as the authors also mention.

The language of the manuscript is generally very good, a few small points are listed below:

-page 4, the last sentence: “In a Finnish study it was found a slower progression of retinopathy in parous women than in nulliparous” may be better defined as: “In a Finnish study a slower progression of retinopathy was found in parous women than in nulliparous”.

-page 11, 4th line from bottom of the page: “sight-threatening” may be better states as “sight-threatening”.

-page 13, 9th line from bottom of the page: “For exemple” should be “For example”.

We have done all the corrections in the text and they are now written in red.

The second reviewer was number 39368.

He did not ask us to make any changes in the text.

All the sentences that are marked in yellow were rephrased after the CrossCheck results.

The words that were in common with another publication from our group were those pertinent to the methodology using the same population in two different publications.

Yours sincerely,

Carlos Negrato, Md, PhD