

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thanks very much for taking your time to review our manuscript "Role of glycolysis in diabetic atherosclerosis" (Manuscript NO.: 86775). I really appreciate all your comments and suggestions! Please find my itemized responses in below and my revisions/corrections in the re-submitted files.

Response to the reviewer's comments:

reviewer 1:

Thank you very much for your approval of my article. My responses are as follows.

1. Response to comment: Title. Although the title reflects the main subject of the manuscript, still the title may be revised. The title should also reflect it is a review paper and which type of review it is.

**Response:** We change the title to "Role of glycolysis in diabetic atherosclerosis: A review of the literature".

2. Response to comment: Key Words. Some other key word may be given to reflect the focus of the manuscript. Because, the given key words are matching with the title of the manuscript. They should be different from the title for wider searchability of the article.

**Response:** We change key words into "Atherosclerotic plaque; hyperglycemia; trained immunity; microRNAs; gut microbiota; drugs"

reviewer 2:

Thank you very much for your valuable advice. My responses are as follows.

1. Response to comment: Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

**Response:** I added a few controversial points about the treatment of diabetic atherosclerosis (Page7,line1-4; Page9,last 3 lines), use the latest data (Page 2, marked with yellow), and highlighted the years of the latest literature in the references (after 2020, marked with purple).

2. Response to comment: The discussion section is modest.

**Response:** We have made changes to the discussion section and added as appropriate. (Page6, line 3-7; Page7, last 6-7 line and last two lines; Page9, last 4-6 line; Page 13, last 10-11 line; Page16-17, marked with yellow)

3. Response to comment: Abstract: not properly written.

**Response:** I read the requirements for writing abstracts and revised them accordingly, especially in terms of word count.

4. Response to comment: Conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

**Response:** We have rewritten the conclusion in terms of logic and emphasis.

5. Response to comment: The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning.

**Response:** We have revised the discussion section of the article, reducing the simple

statement of details, adding our own summary and enhancing the logic of the article. (Page3, marked with yellow; Page5, last Line-Page6, line1-2; Page12, last two lines and Page13, line1-4; Page14, marked with yellow; Page 15, marked with yellow; Page18, marked with yellow)

6. Response to comment: Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

**Response:** We worked with native English speakers to conduct a thorough examination of the article and the inadequacies have been modified.

7. Response to comment: English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

**Response:** We have invited native English speakers to help us improve the overall English writing style. The new language certificate is as follows.



Thank you again for reviewing our paper. Your professional input is essential for us to further improve the quality and accuracy of our papers. We value your feedback and hope that our changes and responses will meet your requirements. If there are any other areas that need to be improved, please point them out and we will do our best to correct them and provide a better version.

Sincerely wish you a happy work!

With regards

Qianjia Liu

## Round 2

specific comments of re-reviewer to authors: The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?

Dear editor and reviewer, Thank you very much for your valuable advice. We have added some appropriate additions to the discussion and results sections, and carried out further extensions: laid out our conjectures and the directions for further research. (Page7, line14-19;Page10, line13-18;Page14, line12-13;Page 16, line 12-16; Page 18, last 3-4 line; Page 19, line 14-21)