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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Ellen Mills,

We are most grateful for your thorough review and for giving us the opportunity to re-submit our manuscript. Based upon the comments we have carefully re-edited the manuscript and made some changes and clarifications.

Please, find below our specific answers and our derived actions.

Sincerely yours

Trine Boesgaard, MD

We have carried out a thorough proof-reading of the text and made a considerable number of corrections throughout the manuscript. All changes are marked in red font.

1. Can you improve the Abstract as follows:

A shorter title for your manuscript would suffice "Further evidence that mutations in INS can be a rare cause of maturity-onset diabetes of the young".
Please also define MODY, MODYX, GDM, GAD and OGTT in abstract.
The results section of the abstract could be shortened as approaching the length of the results section in the manuscript.

I have changed the title and defined MODY etc., also I have shorted a bit in the abstract

2. Confirm in the methods section that consent and ethical approval was obtained. We appreciate that you indeed have consent to publish.
Done and thanks

3. The associate editor was unclear as to whether the patients within the diabetes groups, for example MODY, were unrelated and would have liked to know a little more about what family history data they collected.

We have tried to clarify how the diabetes groups had been collected:

“INS was sequenced in 116 unrelated MODYX probands” and “Additional family members to the probands with an INS mutation were examined and screened for the family specific INS mutation.”

Once the above changes have been made we can proceed to peer-review. You can provide the above changes in a revised manuscript following the instructions at the foot of this email.

Thanks a lot looking forward for that.