

Reviewer #1

- **Comment 1:** The manuscript is focused on reviewing current data on the remission of diabetes after Bariatric Surgery. I deem this mini-review concise and yet thorough. Data collection appears properly discussed and nicely presented. Still, I have some concerns about literature research. Following PRISMA guidelines as recommended for systematic reviews (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses), I suggest including in the methods the research period, which combinations of keywords were used in the strings of research, and the criteria for eligibility and exclusion of studies, giving a rationale. Moreover, it would be useful to describe the method of data extraction, of results combination, and the possible bias and limits of each study included in the review. Nevertheless, addressing the issues above, the review represents a valuable contribution to confirm effectiveness of BS in treating diabetes compared to medical therapy alone, even with long-term data.
- **Response 1:** We apologize for this and thank you for your comment. We have added a “Methods” section with the information required:
“A comprehensive search of the published literature in Pubmed, Pubmed Central (PMC), EMBASE, Medline, and the Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials databases was conducted until January 2021. We used the guidelines of 2015 Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P). Randomised controlled trials with at least 12 months of follow-up and prediction models of diabetes remission after bariatric surgery were included. Keywords containing “obesity”, “metabolic [or] bariatric surgery”, “type 2 diabetes”, “diabetes remission”, “predict”, “prediction models” and “score” were constructed for inclusion. Only studies in english language were included.”
Regarding the limitations of the studies included in the review, we have addressed them concisely and accordingly with sentences such as “One of the limitations of this score was that insulin and other antidiabetic medications used were not taken into account” and “Unfortunately, biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch was not included in this score even though this procedure has been associated with higher remissions of associated comorbidities”. We did a more descriptive manuscript to prevent from generating any type of bias in the readers.

Science Editor

- **Comment 2:** Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated.
- **Response 2:** Thank you for this clarification. We have less than 10% of self-cited references (2 out of 32 citations). We believe they are closely related to the topic and strengthen the data.