

**Reviewer #1:**

Specific Comments to Authors: This commentary doesn't include the studies which can highlight the impact of metabolic surgeries on diabetes in humans. There is lot of literature where diabetes had gone into remission post metabolic surgery but there was literally no mention of that in the commentary. I would suggest to include more human data in the commentary.

**Answer:** Thank you so much for pointing out the lack of human studies in this editorial. By including studies focusing on the impact of metabolic surgery on human diabetes in this editorial, we definitely improved the quality of the editorial and learned a lot.

**Reviewer #2:**

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?

**Answer:** Thank you so much for pointing out the weakness of this editorial and by rewriting the results and discussion section and discussing the existence of the phenomenon, we definitely improved the quality of the editorial and learned a lot.

2. Conclusion: not properly written.

**Answer:** Thank you so much for pointing out that the conclusion is not properly written in this editorial. I have rewritten the conclusion and learned a lot.

3. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.

**Answer:** Thank you so much for pointing out the the arguments are simply describing details without providing meaning. By rewriting the discussion and more logically segmenting and linked the findings to some literature, we definitely improved the quality of the editorial and

learned a lot.

**Reviewer #3:**

I have some notes, in the introduction part that should be checked grammatically, and there must be a space between a word and brackets used for referencing. The highlights of the chosen article were written very well and discussing those newly founded notes was great. Great job wish you the best.

**Answer:** Thank you so much for pointing out the there are some errors in the introduction and in the layout in the manuscript and they have been revised.

## Round 2

Reviewer 1: The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.

Answer 1: Thank you so much for providing the constructive comment on improving the discussion part of this editorial. I have reorganized the discussion by adding a summary point to each paragraph and combined my opinion with the chosen article's. The revised parts is highlighted by yellowing and the revised manuscript would be upload as attachment. The sincere comment really helps a lot to improve the quality of this editorial.

Reviewer 2: I am not satisfied with the name of the title.

Answer 2: Thank you so much for providing the constructive comment on changing the editorial's title. I have changed the title from "Impact of Bariatric Surgery and Surgical Procedures on Metabolism in Diabetes Animal Models and Diabetes Patients" to "Effect of Bariatric Surgery on Metabolism in Diabetes and Obesity Comorbidity: Insight from Recent Research", which might make it more suitable for being a title for editorial. The sincere comment really helps a lot to improve the quality of this editorial.