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Author’s response to reviews:

Technical Comments:

1) Subjects and methods: these details should appear under the 'Pathophysiological investigations' heading and not before the Declarations.

→ The position replacement was executed as above.

2) Discussion and conclusions: these should be provided as two separate headings.

→ “Discussion” and “Conclusions” were separated.
3) Authors contributions: please clarify whether TO, HK and EA provided any further contribution to the study beyond critically revising and approving the manuscript as these do not appear sufficient to warrant authorship according to our authorship criteria (see https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies#authorship).

→ The authors TO, HK and EA contributed not only in critically revising, but also to be involved in drafting the manuscript. This was added in Author’s contribution.

Editor Comments:

BMC Endocrine Disorders operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Diarmuid Smith (Reviewer 1): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

The paper has been rewritten and is much improved, however there remains one or two language issues with the manuscript, which should be changed before publication but they are now minor.

Thank you for kind comments on our manuscript, and we corrected sentences and words as the reviewer requested.
Abstract line 26 to 28 needs to be rewritten (line starting "this clinical course..")

→ The sentence “This clinical course let us confirm the final diagnosis was GDI in this patient.” was replaced as “Based on these observations, clinical diagnosis of GDI was confirmed.”.

Page 4 line 1 remove the word "was"

→ ”was” was removed.

Page 4 line 34 needs to change; remove "reached a concentration"

→ “reached a concentration” was removed.

Page 6 last line change the word resolve to resolution

→ “resolve” was changed to “resolution”.

Page 7 change the word sustained to remained

→ “sustained” was changed to “remained”.

Mark Hannon (Reviewer 2): Thank you for your extensive revisions. I would request that Figure 1a be revised - it is too busy and the in/out balance section is hard to read.

→ Thank you for the kind comments. In 1st revision, the diagnosis of DI and fluid intake data were requested by Reviewer 3. Then, I created Fig. 1A to visualize the in and out balance, which was nicely controlled by the oral DDAVP treatment and after the delivery. Thus, I would like to keep Fig. 1A in this style to describe precise time course of her water balance. You may take a casual glance and understand what happened to her in chronological manner.