

Dear Reviewer,

Re: Resubmission of manuscript reference no. 53333

Thank you very much for constructive critiques regarding our manuscript 53333. As you suggested, we have revised the manuscript according to the reviewer's recommendations. The reviewer's comments were highly insightful and enabled us to greatly improve the quality of our manuscript. Below are our point-by-point responses to the reviewer's comments. Major changes are highlighted by red color in the revised manuscript.

1. Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Overall, the abstract summarizes satisfactorily the main findings of the study. Relatively to the abstract, I have the following comments. a) T2DM (or DM) should be defined. At any instance, the authors should use either T2DM or DM throughout the manuscript. b) "trace blood glucose" : simply state « blood glucose ».

Response: Thank you for pointing out our problem. We apologize for the language problems in the original manuscript. Following the reviewer's suggestion, We have used T2DM throughout the manuscript. In addition, We added two articles as a supplement to fasting blood glucose.

2. Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Keywords are missing in the main manuscript file and should be added.

Response: Thanks for reminding us about the information of keywords. The three keywords we added are Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) ,Lifestyle interventions and Rural.

3. Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Figure number 1 presents a problem as the x-axis is labeled in Chinese language. Overall, figure 1 should/could be removed as it simply presents the compliance rate for each intervention group. This information is redundant as it is already presented into the abstract.

Response: Thanks for this valuable recommendation. We have revised content regarding this point.

4. Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? I believe that the statistical analysis is appropriate. In this respect, data in table 1 clearly show that after the intervention blood pressure, glycaemia and glycated albumin are decreasing. It appears that also body weight and waist circumference decrease (in a statistically significant way) but actually the magnitude of the decrease is minimal. Perhaps the use of a paired-test explain the significance. I suggest, however, that the authors present the primary data in a supplementary file so that the reader may appreciate the existence of significant differences even if the absolute magnitude of body mass decrease and waist circumference decrease is minimal. A second major

problem that should be addressed by the authors is the fact that the data in the table are pooling the 4 interventional conditions. It is clear that the reader would like to see the results from each one of the 4 interventional protocols.

Response: Thanks for the detailed recommendation. we have presented the primary data in a supplementary file.

5. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? I strongly suggest that the manuscript is reviewed/edited by a native English speaker to greatly improve the linguistic presentation.

Response: We deeply appreciate the reviewer's suggestion. Language presentation was improved with assistance from a native English speaker with appropriate research background.

In summary, we thank the reviewer for the insightful and constructive analyses of this work. In this revised manuscript, we have addressed all the concerns thoroughly. We hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses will be sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in the World Journal of Diabetes.