

Dear editor and reviewers,

Thanks for the comments on my manuscript "p66Shc-mediated oxidative stress is involved in gestational diabetes mellitus" (No. 69840). We appreciate and accept the modification suggestions and have revised the manuscript accordingly. The revised parts are shown in boldface type. The detailed responses to the reviewers' comments are presented as follows.

Reviewer #1

Comments:

Manuscript Title: p66Shc-mediated oxidative stress is involved in gestational diabetes mellitus. 1- Title reflected the main subject of the manuscript. 2- The abstract summarized and reflect the described in the manuscript. 3- Key words reflected the focus of the manuscript. 4- The manuscript adequately described the background, presented status and significance of the study. 5- The manuscript described methods (e.g., patients, Collection and processing of specimens, Cell culture, Cell transfection, RNA isolation, qRT-PCR, Hematoxylin-eosin staining and immunohistochemistry, Reactive oxygen species detection by dihydroethidium, Western blotting and Statistical analysis, etc.) in adequate detail. 6- The research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. Authors investigate the expression of Drp1 and p66Shc and its possible mechanism in the pathogenesis of GDM. 7- The manuscript interpreted the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. 8- Manuscript included sufficient, good quality Tables and Figures. 9- The manuscript cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. 10- The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented and the style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriated.

Response:

The reviewer did not put forward specific suggestions for modification. Thank you for affirming our manuscript.

Reviewer #2

Comments 1:

The images and tables are relevant and informative, and the conclusion tries to provide a theoretical basis and practical reference for the primary cause of cell damage and apoptosis during the occurrence and development of GDM. Editing and proofreading are needed to maintain the best sense of reading;

Response 1:

We conducted a new statistical analysis of the original data and a new Western blot experiment, and we revised and reedited the images and tables in the manuscript (Fig2, Fig3, Fig4, Table 2).

Comments 2:

The discussion section is general and should discuss the results of this present study more precisely;

Response 2:

In the revised manuscript, we further discussed the relationship among p66Shc, Drp1 and ROS in GDM, and made a deeper analysis of their potential mechanism.(see “discussion”,marked in red).

Comments 3:

The overall number of subjects is not very large. In my opinion this is a controlled observational study. How many patients have been excluded in the past few years? Please add limitations of your study the direction of more future studies to the discussion, if possible.

Response 3:

As we mentioned in the manuscript, the GDM patients we selected were untreated patients with poor glycemic control, which is a small amount of patients in clinical practice (see “materials and methods”, marked in red). Limited sample is a shortcoming of this study, we have described it in the manuscript (see “discussion”,marked in red). Our focus is to investigate the potential mechanism of p66Shc in GDM in vivo, and we will expand our clinical sample to further investigate and validate the role of p66Shc in GDM (see “discussion”,marked in red).

Reviewer #3

Comments:

Figure 2, 3E and 4C are not very clear. What is the magnification power used, it should be noted on the figures.

Response:

In the revised manuscript, we reedited Fig2, Fig3E, and Fig4C and added magnification and scale to the images.

Science editor

Comments:

Please add limitations of your study the direction of more future studies to the discussion, if possible.

Response:

Limited sample is a shortcoming of this study, we have described it in the manuscript (see “discussion”,marked in red). Our focus is to investigate the potential mechanism of p66Shc in GDM in vivo, and we will expand our clinical sample to further investigate and validate the role of p66Shc in GDM (see “discussion”,marked in red).

Company editor-in-chief

Comments:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Diabetes, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response:

Thank you for affirming our manuscript.

Once again, thank you for your constructive comments and suggestions which would help us both in English and in depth to improve the quality of the paper.

Kind regards,
Ting-ting Huang
E-mail:htt100200120@126.com

Corresponding author:Baoxia Cui
E-mai:cuibaoxia@sdu.edu.cn