

Dear Editor

Thank you very much for your consideration of our manuscript. Here, we resubmit our revised version of the manuscript. We carefully consider all your constructions and suggestions as well as the comments of the reviewer and editor. Changes in the initial version of the manuscript are highlighted.

Please find below a point-by-point response to the reviewer's concerns. We look forward to your reconsideration of our revised manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

On behalf of the co-authors,

Prof. Manal S. Fawzy

Reviewer #1

I am really grateful to review this manuscript. In my opinion, this manuscript can be published once some revisions are done successfully. This study reviewed articles on the associations among air pollution, diabetes and thyroid disease. I would argue that this is a good start. However, the flow diagram and the summary tables of study methods, sample size, data type, model performances and important predictors need to be added for better external validation.

Authors response

We appreciate the time you put into reviewing this manuscript. Kindly our manuscript is an ordinary review article, not a systematic review that requires flow diagram and/or sample size/data type justification. However, the authors did their best to follow the valuable suggestion to enrich the review with summary tables for the impact of the specified pollutants on human health summarized in Tables 1 - 5.

Reviewer #2

Eva M. Kruger et al. present a miniature narrative review of the relationship between air pollution, diabetes mellitus, and thyroid cancer, it's very interesting. After reviewing the data, there is a large literature on the relationship between air pollution, diabetes and thyroid cancer, but less literature addressing the relationship between the three, thus making the authors' arguments relatively novel. Throughout, the manuscript has some minor deficiencies, which the authors are advised to revise.

Authors response

We appreciate the time you put into reviewing this manuscript. Based on the valued suggestions of the referee, the authors revised the manuscript and addressed the raised concerns accordingly. Kindly note that all revised text is highlighted in yellow to be easily identified.

1. It is suggested that "Pathogenesis" be listed separately as a subheading at an appropriate place in the manuscript, otherwise it looks messy.

Authors response

Thanks for the remark. Based on the referee's recommendation, the pathogenesis section has been listed separately.

2. It is suggested that the limitations of this review be added.

Authors response

Thanks for the remark. The authors followed the referee's suggestion and added the limitations by the end of the review.

3. It is suggested that your thoughts on the future be briefly described.

Authors response

Thanks for the remark. Based on the valued suggestion of the referee, thoughts on the future were briefly described.

4. About the format:

1) Many places in the manuscript are missing spaces (although this may be due to file downloads, the authors are advised to revise carefully);

Based on the valued remarks, the authors fixed the raised issues.

2) Some references from page 13 onwards have square brackets and inconsistent formatting.

Thanks for the remark. Has been revised and addressed in the revised version of the manuscript.

3) The format of references at the end of the paper is not standardized according to the guidelines of World Journal of Diabetes.

Have been revised. Thanks

5. About spelling:

1) "from 1991-2022" on page 5 is irregularly written;

Has been done. Thanks

2) "PM" on page 5 should be explained when it first appears, not on page 6.

Has been explained appropriately. Thanks

Thanks again for the reviewers' time and efforts.