

We thank the editors and the reviewers for considering our manuscript and advising changes to further improve it. We have incorporated all the changes as suggested by the reviewers. We hope, you will find it appropriate for publication now. However, we will be happy to make any further changes you may suggest.

<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Reviewer's comments</b>	<b>Authors reply</b>	<b>Changes made</b>
#1	If possible, the authors should explain which of the patients' signs and symptoms is more predictive of death at admission?	Thanks for the comments. We agree with the reviewer that adding which signs and symptoms at admission were more predictive of death, will add to manuscripts strength. As this was a review of case reports, there is a lot of heterogenicity in data and hence, it will be beyond the scope of the present study.	No changes made
#2	The supplementary file named "7660-Biostatistics review certificate" is only a duplication of another supplementary file, "76609-Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate."	Necessary changes made	Uploaded the new Biostatistics review certificate
	The authors interchangeably stated to have used PRISMA 2009 and PRISMA 2020 Checklists in the writing of their study. Authors might need to be consistent with the one they used.	Necessary changes made	Changes made in the statement
	Materials and methods: inclusion and exclusion criteria should not be mutually exclusive.	Necessary changes made	Changes made in the methods section
	If the authors used PRISMA 2020, they would need to include "study quality appraisal," "Certainty assessment." Also, the	Necessary changes made	Correction made

	"reasons for exclusions" in the flow diagram.		
	Study design: Authors refer to their study as a meta-summary. Authors might need to follow the steps described by Sandelowski and Barroso (1, 2). Otherwise, I suggest the study design be "a review." Besides, the mean values from the present manuscript's statistical analyses were "arithmetic mean" and NOT "weighted mean" for meta-analyses	Comments noted. Have made necessary changes and changed the design to review.	Changes made in the Title, methods and through the rest of the manuscript as required.
#3	"57/242 (23.6%) had acute ingestion..." - please remove "/242" or use this presentation method for all data "most commonly reported", "most common at the time" - please try to use some synonyms	Necessary changes made	Changes made in Abstract
	maybe the selection of keywords can be revised	Necessary changes made	Changes made in keywords
	"other complications have also been reported that may complicate" - complications that complicate - please rewrite	Necessary changes made	Necessary changes made
	I think it is important in the introduction section to present what severe metformin toxicity means	Necessary changes made	Changes made in introduction
	"criteria were included in this meta summary (Appendix 1)" - please remove "in this meta summary"	Necessary changes made	Necessary changes made
	"Overall, 57/242 (23.6%) had acute ingestion" - the same comment previously presented	Necessary changes made	Changes made in the results
	First you said "Two hundred fourteen (88.4%) patients had	Sorry, for causing any confusion. These 185	Changes made in the

	underlying diabetes and were on metformin (table 1)", then you said "Overall, 185 (76.4%) patients were on long-term therapeutic doses of metformin when they developed metformin toxicity" - I don't understand what causes the discrepancy	patients were those who developed metformin toxicity while on therapeutic doses. However, 29 patients, out of 57 patients who had presented with acute ingestion (overdose) were also diabetics and where prescribed metformin.	results section
	"The cumulative mortality was 37/185 (20%) in this group of patients" - What group of patients? Why using again 37/185?	In this group of patients who had developed toxicity while on therapeutic doses.	Changes made in the results section
	"had documented reasons which may have caused" - I think it will be better to say "had documented reasons, which..." or "had documented reasons that..."	Necessary changes made	Changes made in results
	- "Out of these 185 patients, 38 patients had underlying CKD" and "Overall, 41 (16.9%) patients had underlying CKD and were on dialysis support" - the three patients had acute intoxication?	Yes, 3 CKD patients had presented with acute intoxication	No changes made
	I think that it will be useful to present the CKD stage, if possible	I agree, but the relevant data is not available in most of the case reports. However, most of these patients were stage V CKD on IHD/PD	No changes made
	The presentation of the results is quite confusing. I think it would be important to make it clear that the patients were divided into two groups of 57 and 185 patients respectively,	Necessary changes made	Division and explanation added in the first para of the results

	what each of these groups represented and why you decided to group them in this way.		
	“MALA was the most commonly reported side effect” - please find a way to express this issue without repeating yourself throughout the manuscript	Necessary changes made	Changes made throughout the manuscript
	“pH being 6.28” - was this pH compatible with life?	It is really surprising, that is why we have highlighted it in our article. This patient is reported to have survived. Re-checked the reference paper.	No changes made
	“where SLED was used in a few patients patients (5.4%) for initial RRT” - delete the word “patients”	Necessary changes made	Changes made
	“significantly higher levels of lactates and metformin levels” - please avoid repeating words	Necessary changes made	Changes made
	I think that the last paragraph from the Discussion section should be included in the previous one, or should be rephrased.	Necessary changes made	Changes made in discussion
#4	The review by Juneja D is interesting with some of value. It emphasizes that despite severe MALA and the need for multiple organ support, they may have good outcomes. I suggest the manuscript be accepted after minor revision.	Thanks for your comments	Have made the necessary changes