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Comparison of glycemic control and β-cell function in new onset T2DM patients with PCOS of metformin and saxagliptin monotherapy or combination treatment

Tao Tao; Peihong Wu; Yuying Wang; Wei Liu
BMC Endocrine Disorders

Dear Editor,

Thank you for notifying us that our revised manuscript will be accepted once we have carried out some essential revisions. We really appreciate the editor and reviewers for their thoughtful and insightful comments. In the point-by-point responses to reviewers, we have carefully reviewed all the issues from you and the reviewers, and made some changes according to the advice.

We believe that our revisions have improved our manuscript and hope that it is now acceptable for publication in BMC Endocrine Disorders.

Sincerely yours,

Tao Tao
(on behalf of all authors)
comments from editor:

1. Please can you confirm whether any participants were under 18 years old?

We have confirmed that all the participants were adults and above 18 years old.

2. Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated.

We have added the email addresses for all authors on the title page.

3. In the section 'Ethics and consent to participate' please confirm whether informed consent to participate was written or verbal. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure.

The informed consent to participate was written, and we have added it in the 'Ethics and consent to participate' section.

4. Please provide the date that your trial was registered alongside the statement retrospectively registered.

We have added the date of trial registration alongside the statement retrospectively registered.

5. We note that many paragraphs in the Methods section have some textual overlap with other previously published works, particularly:

The paper “Distribution of adiponectin multimeric forms in Chinese women with polycystic ovary syndrome and their relation to insulin resistance (2010), European Society of Endocrinology” which has overlap with the section ‘Anthropometric measurements’.

And the paper “Comparison of Metformin and Repaglinide Monotherapy in the Treatment of New Onset Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in China (2014) doi: 10.1155/2014/294017”

While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. Therefore, we would appreciate if you try to minimise direct repetition of large sections of previously published text.

We have revised the Methods section and avoided direct repetition of large sections of previously published text.
6. Please provide further clarification regarding your availability of data and material. Data availability statements can take one of the following forms (or a combination of more than one if required for multiple datasets):

- The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are available in the [NAME] repository, [PERSISTENT WEB LINK TO DATASETS]

- The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

- All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].

- The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due [REASON WHY DATA ARE NOT PUBLIC] but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

- Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

- The data that support the findings of this study are available from [third party name] but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. Data are however available from the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of [third party name].

- Not applicable. If your manuscript does not contain any data, please state 'Not applicable' in this section.

Please note that if you do wish to share your raw data and do not have consent from all patients to publish this data it will need to be de-identified.

Please also note that if you include your raw data as a supplementary file you will need to provide, after the References, a section titled “Additional files” where you list the following information about each of your supplementary files: * File name (e.g. Additional file 1), * Title of data, * Description of data. All additional files will also need to have been cited in the main manuscript.

We have taken the second form above (The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.) instead of the previous one in the manuscript.

7. Please address the reviewers comments below.

We have responded the reviewers’ comments point-by-point in this letter below.
8. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

We submitted the clean version of our manuscript, as well as tables and figures.

Editor Comments:

Akinobu Nakamura (Reviewer 1): The authors have made substantial changes that, to my mind, mean that their data are presented much better in the context of existing published work.

We thank the reviewer for the time and efforts in commenting our manuscript. We are encouraged by the positive evaluation of our work.

Yuki Matsuhashi (Reviewer 2): which is correct of the unit of insulin " μu/ml (line 169) or " uIU/ml (line 227) " ?

is the " uIU/ml " mean " micro IU/ml " ?

why the scale of insulin concentration treated with metformin was different (figure) ?

We appreciate the reviewer’s carefulness in reviewing our manuscript. The unit of insulin should be “μIU/mL”. The “μ”, which means “micro”, might not be displayed in some software, so we used “u” instead of “μ” in the previous manuscript. However, this replacement could be quite misleading. So in this revision, we have changed all the units of insulin into “μIU/mL” in the manuscript, Table 2 and the figure.