

Dear editor,

Thank you for the editors We would like to thank the editors and reviewers for their careful assessment of our article; their suggestions have strengthened the manuscript.

And also we have revised the paper according to the review's comments.

Sincerely yours,

Xiaodong Sun

Response to editor's comments:

Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Diabetes, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. When revising the manuscript, it is recommended that the author supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply PubMed, or a new tool, the RCA, of which data source is PubMed. RCA is a unique artificial intelligence system for citation index evaluation of medical science and life science literature. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>, or visit PubMed at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>.

Response: Thank you very much for your review with valuable suggestions. We greatly appreciate the time you have contributed to the review process. We have provided the Signed Informed Consent Form.

Response to Reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The submitted editorial addresses the recent, concerning development in diabetes management that rapid glycemia corrections may unexpectedly lead to microvascular complications in diabetes. The authors have highlighted an important issue that is presently understudied. The editorial is well-written and balanced and concludes very reasonably that prioritizing an individualized, comprehensive care approach is essential to ensure long-term well-being. The editorial is a welcome summary and opinion piece on the subject and I have no concerns with recommending publication as it is.

Response: Thank you very much for your review with valuable suggestions. We greatly appreciate the time you have contributed to the review process.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I read with great interest the editorial entitled "Balancing Act: The Dilemma of Rapid Hyperglycemia Correction in Diabetes Management". The authors have highlighted a pertinent but often ignored issue of diabetes management. The manuscript is well researched and well written.

Response: Thank you very much for your review with valuable suggestions. We greatly appreciate the time you have contributed to the review process.