

Dear Editor, Dear reviewers

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "MicroRNA-630 alleviates inflammatory reactions in diabetic kidney disease rats by targeting TLR4" (ID87873) dated December 25. We were pleased to know that our work was rated as potentially acceptable for publication in Journal, subject to appropriate revision. We thank the reviewers for the time and effort that they have put into reviewing the previous version of the manuscript. Their suggestions have enabled us to improve our work. Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript. Accordingly, we have uploaded a copy of the original manuscript with all the changes highlighted by using the track changes mode in MS Word. Appended to this letter is our point-by-point response to the comments raised by the reviewers. The comments are reproduced and our responses are given directly afterward in a different color (red). We would like also to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript.

We hope that the revised manuscript is accepted for publication in the Journal of the World Journal of Diabetes.

Sincerely.

Qiang He.

Reviewer #1:

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

### **Specific Comments to Authors:**

1 The title reflects the hypothesis of the manuscript.

2 The abstract summarizes and reflects the work (just the 1st and 2nd sentence under methods are saying absolutely the same thing and in the sentence after the second sentence there is lack of clarity which has not been clarified in the main manuscript).

3 The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.

4 The manuscript describes the background present state and importance of this study. (a correction in the second sentence of introduction- while GFR declines in DKD, albuminuria progresses- in contrast to decline as stated by the authors)

5 The methods are described in adequate detail (i just have a minor detail I need clarification as mentioned under the abstract).

6 Results. The research objectives are achieved by the results of this experiment. The results established a clear link between microRNA-680 and inflammatory markers and interstitial fibrosis associated with DKD. The results show that microRNA-630 could be a potential biomarker for DKD and potentially a therapeutic target.

7 The manuscript interprets the results adequately and appropriately and their discussion is very relevant to clinical practice.

8 The illustrations and tables are good and describe the results clearly perhaps a timeline would have addressed the question I raised about the lack of clarity of the third sentence in the methods under methods of abstract.

9 The manuscript meets the biostatistic requirements,

10 The manuscript meets the requirements of SI unit

11 References are good.

12 The manuscript is well presented, concise and coherentl.

13 Authors prepared manuscript to Arrive standards (no document seen though).

14 Ethics statements.I cant find the ethical statement for animals, but since grants were given I suppose it id available but author have not provided could the author please provide, The study is a very important one providing insights molecular markers that may influence the developement and progression of DKD to ESRD and potentially introduces a clinical marker and potential therapeutic target, My specific comment were already addressed under the points. I would attach a document where these areas are highlighted,

Response: We appreciate the reviewer' s positive evaluation of our work and We are grateful for the suggestion.

2.For the second comment, the first and second sentences of the method are indeed repeated, and the first sentence has been deleted. For the third sentence,to be more clear and in accordance with the reviewer concerns, we have added a brief description as follows: In the second week of modeling, the rats were divided into control, DKD, negative control of lentivirus (DKD+NC agomir), and miR-630 overexpression (DKD+miR-630 agonir)groups.

4. For the third comment on the relationship between the glomerular filtration rate of DKD and proteinuria, the peer review experts suggested that it was accurate, and we have made corresponding amendments.

5. We have reorganized the language expression for the same problem pointed out in comment 2.

13. The document of Arrive standards pointed out by peer reviewers has been submitted in the revised manuscript document as required.

14. Relevant documents on Ethics statements and animal ethics review have also been submitted as required in the revised draft document, please review.

The highlighted places in the reviewer's review documents have also been revised accordingly. Thank you again for your careful review work.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:**

Thanks for nice article.

**Response:** We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work and We are grateful for the suggestion.

On the issue of language polishing, according to the requirements of the magazine and the recommended polishing company, Editage Company has been selected to polish the language and provided the polishing certificate.

## **EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS**

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

**(1) Science editor:**

**1 Conflict of interest statement:** Academic Editor has no conflict of interest.

**2 Academic misconduct:** No academic misconduct was found.

**3 Scientific quality:** The author submitted a study of microRNA-630 alleviates inflammatory reactions in diabetic kidney disease rats by targeting TLR4. The manuscript is overall qualified.

(1) Advantages and disadvantages: The reviewers have given positive peer-review reports for the manuscript. Classification: Grade B and Grade B; Language Quality: Grade B and Grade B. A very important scientific study with potential to affect clinical practice. The title reflects the hypothesis of the manuscript. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work (just the 1st and 2nd sentence under methods are saying absolutely the same thing and in the sentence after the second sentence there is

lack of clarity which has not been clarified in the main manuscript). The manuscript is well presented, concise and coherent.

(2) Main manuscript content: The author clearly stated the purpose of the study and the research structure is complete. However, the manuscript is still required a further revision according to the detailed comments listed below.

(3) Table(s) and figure(s): There are 5 Figures and 1 Tables should be improved. Detailed suggestions for each are listed in the specific comments section.

(4) References: A total of 32 references are cited, including 1 published in the last 3 years. The reviewer didn't request the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself.

**4 Language evaluation:** The English-language grammatical presentation needs to be improved to a certain extent. There are many errors in grammar and format, throughout the entire manuscript. Before final acceptance, the authors must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>.

**5 Specific comments:** (1) Please provide the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited, including A,B, arrows, etc. With respect to the reference to the Figure, please verify if it is an original image created for the manuscript, if not, please provide the source of the picture and the proof that the Figure has been authorized by the previous publisher or copyright owner to allow it to be redistributed. All legends are incorrectly formatted and require a general title and explanation for each figure. Such as Figure 1 title. A: ; B: ; C: .

(2) Please obtain permission for the use of picture(s). If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published, and correctly indicate the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable.

(3) Please don't include any \*, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @....in your manuscript; Please use superscript numbers for illustration; and for statistical significance, please use superscript letters. Statistical significance is expressed as  $aP < 0.05$ ,  $bP < 0.01$  ( $P > 0.05$  usually does not need to be denoted). If there are other series of P values,  $cP < 0.05$  and  $dP < 0.01$  are used, and a third series of P values is expressed as  $eP < 0.05$  and  $fP < 0.01$ .

(4) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text (and directly before the References).

(5) Please add the Core tip section. The number of words should be controlled between 50-100 words.

**6 Recommendation:** Conditional acceptance.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response: We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work and We are grateful for the suggestion.

With the comment 2 of peer review expert 1, the above has been answered. The format of the chart has been revised according to the requirements of your journal and the corresponding documents have been uploaded. The problem of language retouching has been retouched as required and proved. The article highlights section and the core tip section have been supplemented in the revised draft.◦

Dear prof. Jia-Ping Yan and dear reviewers

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "MicroRNA-630 alleviates inflammatory reactions in diabetic kidney disease rats by targeting TLR4" (ID87873) dated January 24. We were pleased to know that our work was rated as potentially acceptable for publication in Journal, subject to appropriate revision. We thank the reviewers for the time and effort that they have put into reviewing the previous version of the manuscript. Their suggestions have enabled us to improve our work. Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript. Accordingly, we have uploaded a copy of the original manuscript with all the changes highlighted by using the track changes mode in MS Word. Appended to this letter is our point-by-point response to the comments raised by the reviewers. The comments from Professor Wu align closely with those from the peer reviewers. The responses to the peer reviewers' comments have been addressed when responding to their reviews, which suggests that the version of the manuscript Professor Wu reviewed might have been the initial one. Nonetheless, we are deeply appreciative of Professor Wu's invaluable suggestions. The comments are reproduced and our responses are given directly afterward in a different color (red). We hope that the revised manuscript is accepted for publication in the Journal of the World Journal of Diabetes.

Sincerely.

Qiang He.

Reviewer #1: prof. Qi-Nan Wu

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION
--------------------	------------------	------------

<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

### Specific Comments to Authors:

1 The title reflects the hypothesis of the manuscript.

2 The abstract summarizes and reflects the work (just the 1st and 2nd sentence under methods are saying absolutely the same thing and in the sentence after the second sentence there is lack of clarity which has not been clarified in the main manuscript).

3 The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.

4 The manuscript describes the background present state and importance of this study. (a correction in the second sentence of introduction- while GFR declines in DKD, albuminuria progresses- in contrast to decline as stated by the authors)

5 The methods are described in adequate detail (i just have a minor detail I need clarification as mentioned under the abstract.

6 Results. The research objectives are achieved by the results of this experiment. The results established a clear link between microRNA-680 and inflammatory markers and interstitial fibrosis associated with DKD. The results show that microRNA-630 could be a potential biomarker for DKD and potentially a therapeutic target.

7 The manuscript interprets the results adequately and appropriately and their discussion is very relevant to clinical practice. 8 The



illustrations and tables are good and describe the results clearly perhaps a timeline would have addressed the question I raised about about the lack of clarity of the third sentence in the methods under methods of abstract.

9 The manuscript meets the biostatistic requirements,

10 The manuscript meets the requirements of SI unit

11 References are good.

12 The manuscript is well presented, concise and coherentl.

13 Authors prepared manuscript to Arrive standards (no document seen though).

14 Ethics statements.I cant find the ethical statement for animals, but since grants were given I suppose it id available but author have not provided could the author please provide, The study is a very important one providing insights molecular markers that may influence the developement and progression of DKD to ESRD and potentially introduces a clinical marker and potential therapeutic target, My specific comment were already addressed under the points. I would attach a document where these areas are highlighted,

Response: We appreciate the reviewer' s positive evaluation of our work and We are grateful for the suggestion.

2. For the second comment, the first and second sentences of the method are indeed repeated, and the first sentence has been deleted. For the third sentence, to be more clear and in accordance with the reviewer concerns, we have added a brief description as follows: In the second week of modeling, the rats were divided into control, DKD, negative control of lentivirus (DKD+NC agomir), and miR-630 overexpression (DKD+miR-630 agomir) groups.

original text: Methods Six-week-old male rats were injected with streptozotocin (STZ) to establish a hyperglycemic diabetic model. Streptozotocin (STZ) was administered to six-week-old male rats to create a hyperglycemic diabetic model. After one and four weeks, the control and hyperglycemic diabetic mice were separated into four groups (control, DKD, DKD+NC agomir (LV-NC), DKD+ miR-630 agomir (LV-miR-630) by intraperitoneal injection of agomir NC, miR-630 agomir (50 nM).

Revised:

## METHODS

Streptozotocin was administered to six-week-old male rats to create a hyperglycemic diabetic model. In the second week of modeling, the rats were

divided into control, DKD, negative control of lentivirus, and miR-630 overexpression groups.

4. For the third comment on the relationship between the glomerular filtration rate of DKD and proteinuria, the peer review experts suggested that it was accurate, and we have made corresponding amendments.

**original text:** The chronic kidney condition known as diabetic kidney disease (DKD), which is caused by diabetes, is characterized by a steady decline in albuminuria and glomerular filtration rate.

**Revised:**

Diabetic kidney disease (DKD), a chronic kidney condition due to diabetes, is characterized by a steady decline in glomerularfiltrationrate and the onset and progression of albuminuria.

5. We have reorganized the language expression for the same problem pointed out in comment 2.

13. The document of Arrive standards pointed out by peer reviewers has been submitted in the revised manuscript document as required.

14. Relevant documents on Ethics statements and animal ethics review have also been submitted as required in the revised draft document, please review.

The highlighted places in the reviewer's review documents have also been revised accordingly. Thank you again for your careful review work.

Reviewer #2: prof. Jia-Qing Shao

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority forpublication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

JOURNAL EDITORIAL BOARD COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors responded well to the reviewer's and editor's comments.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work and We are grateful for the suggestion.