

Responses to the Reviewers' and Editor's Comments

Manuscript NO.: 73425

Manuscript title: " The uses of knockout, knockdown, and transgenic models in the studies of glucose transporter 4"

The authors would like to thank the reviewers and editor for their time and efforts, especially those excellent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to the reviewer's comments. Here are our responses to the reviewers and editor's comments line-by-line. The comments are shown first, which are followed by our responses in italics.

Please note that the words and sentences that have been revised are highlighted in yellow.

1. Reviewer #1

- 1.1. In this manuscript, the authors summarized the recombinant DNA technologies that have been used to study expression profiles and functions of GLUT4 in tissues and cells. This paper is logical, hierarchical and easy to understand. It has certain reference value for the young scholars or students. However, there're two issues which should be addressed. 1. As a review, progress instead of basic knowledges should be focused. All the basic knowledges should be deleted. For example, all the second part named as "Recombinant DNA techniques for the studies of gene and protein functions" should be deleted. In addition, the introduction is too cumbersome, it is recommended to delete most of its content.

Responses: We thank the reviewer for the excellent comments and thoughtful feedback, especially the value of our work for young scholars and students. Therefore, to help those students, we decided to retain some of the languages in section 2. We have revised the subtitle and shortened the whole section to 3 paragraphs from the 5 paragraphs in the previous version. We hope that a short and succinct description will help students to refresh their knowledge and to read our manuscript. In addition, we also revised the introduction section (section 1) to eliminate any cumbersome languages. Please see the revised manuscript for the changes.

- 1.2. Considering that the content of the manuscript has little relation with the theme of the journal (Meta-Analysis), whether it is suitable for the journal needs to be decided by the editor. So, revision should be recommended for this manuscript.

Responses: Thank you for your comments. We agree that the editor should decide.

2. Reviewer #2

Comments: The content of the article is comprehensive and logical. Based on the review comments made by the previous review experts, the author made more comprehensive and reasonable revisions, which better explained the issues raised by the previous experts. In summary, I agree that the magazine will accept this article. The final decision must be based on the editor's opinion.

Responses: Thank the reviewer for the nice comments. We agree that the final decision will be based on the editor's opinion.