



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com <http://www.wjgnet.com>

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Diabetes*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 26370

Manuscript Type: Minireviews

Response to reviewers

Reviewer#1

1. The conclusion in the abstract is too weak. Of course, there is some uncertainty, but the authors need not “sit on the fence”.

Response: *Agreed. The conclusion in the abstract has been revised.*

2. There should be a brief section on toxicity in animal models, where it is possible to study these issues in a relatively “pure culture”.

Response: *Agreed. Toxicity of nitrate and nitrite has been discussed in the manuscript (Page 4, lines 54-67)*

3. The authors do not discuss the potential impact of population incidence of glucose 6 phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency (favism) on the risk of adverse effects from nitrite-induced methemoglobinemia, and whether this might affect risk of type I diabetes.

Response: *To the best of our knowledge, subjects with glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency are more susceptible to developing methemoglobinemia in exposure of nitrate/nitrite; however there is no association between favism or methemoglobinemia and increased risk of type I diabetes (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Case Studies in Environmental Medicine (CSEM) Nitrate/Nitrite Toxicity, 2015). We discussed nitrate/nitrite toxicity such as methemoglobinemia in the manuscript (Page 4, lines 56-60).*

4. The increase of type I diabetes is increasing (introduction). What are the other potential causes/

Response: *The potential reasons for increasing trend of type I diabetes have been mentioned in the introduction (Pages 4, lines 47-53).*

Reviewer#2

-page 3, last line of paragraph 1.1: It is unclear if the authors mean patients < 15 y.o. or patients that presented diabetes for less than 15 years.

Response: *Agreed and corrected (Page 3, lines 32-36).*

-Also, there is some redundancy in adjectives that takes away from the message the authors want to convey (e.g. page 3, line 2 of paragraph 1.2: ...to be important etiologically (relevant?) to beta cells.

Response: *Agreed and corrected (Page 3, lines 37-40).*

-page 5, first three lines: rephrasing is needed).

Response: *Agreed and corrected (Page 5, lines 87-89).*