

Dear Editor-in-Chief and reviewers,

Attached for your consideration is a revised version of the manuscript “**Kidney disease among children and adolescents with diabetes mellitus- a continuous challenge in diagnosis and treatment**” by Carmen Muntean, et al., manuscript (Manuscript NO.: 76719, Minireviews) which was submitted to the *World Journal of Diabetes*.

Thank you for the suggestions that improved the quality of the manuscript, and also for the prompt and concise evaluation. Following the reviewer’s comments, we made the required modifications (written in red color) to the initial version of our manuscript, which we described point-by-point, as follows:

Reviewer 1:

Comments: Title: The title of the manuscript is very broad and can be improved. One option is this: "Diabetic kidney disease in pediatric patients. An update" or "Diabetic nephropathy in pediatric patients. A current review".

Response: **We changed the manuscript title as follows: “DIABETIC KIDNEY DISEASE IN PEDIATRIC PATIENTS. A CURRENT REVIEW”**

Comments: Background: It doesn't describe the present status and significance of the study. The entire background section is focused only on diabetes (in a very general manner)

Response: **Thank you for this remark. We corrected and inserted within the text this aspect.**

Comments: Methods: It is suggested (but not mandatory) that authors include a Methods section. Development of the review article: I recommend that the manuscript should be divided into the following sections: Introduction, Methods, Epidemiology, Pathophysiology, Diagnosis (Include conventional and new biomarkers serum/urinary), as well as treatment (include therapies under investigation).

Response: **Thank you for your observation. We followed your recommendation and we included a method section. Also, we divided the manuscript into suggested sections.**

Comments: Figures: I recommend rearranging the order of tables and figures. Figure 1, which describes the pathophysiology of diabetic nephropathy, should be at the beginning.

Response: **Thank you for your observation. We rearranged the order of tables and figures.**

Comments: Tables: I suggest to delete Table 3 since that information can be written in the text.

Response: **Thank you, we deleted Table 3 and we included the information within the text.**

Comments: Likewise, I suggest including a table that describes the dose adjustment of the main drugs used in diabetic nephropathy (statins, oral antidiabetics, antihypertensives,

among others), according to the stage of kidney disease, obtained according to the glomerular filtration rate.

Response: Thank you, we added a column within Table 5 with the proposed drug and dose adjustment to eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m²).

Comments: Page 12: The correct term is Table 5, instead "Tabel 5".

Response: The entire manuscript was carefully evaluated for the English language. We have checked and corrected the typing errors. Also, we corrected Tabel with Table.

Reviewer 2:

The results suggest that “Novel biomarkers proved valuable tools in the detection of kidney damage in early phases as well as reliable predictors for DKD progression, therefore effective therapies may be proposed.” Although the topic is certainly of interest, some concerns preclude the publication of the manuscript in this journal. The concerns: 1 .It is recommended to list the markers as a separate section. 2. There are some expressions incorrectly, as line 78 “A very recent study” is advised to “a recent study”.

Response: The entire manuscript was carefully evaluated for the English language. We have checked and corrected the typing and expression errors.

The markers are listed in a separate section, namely the 5.2 section: Seric and Urinary biomarkers for DKD.

Response to Editors:

1. The author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA).

R: We improved this.

2. We provided decomposable Figures and we organized them into a single PowerPoint file.

3. Also we modified the tables to standard three-line tables

4. We confirm whether the figures are original (generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper)

Thus, by this letter and by the attached revised version of our manuscript we hope to have fulfilled all the observations and recommendations made by the Reviewers.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

On behalf of all authors of this work,

Yours sincerely,

Carmen Muntean