Dear editors and reviewers:

Thank you very much, for your suggestions to my manuscript titled “Update on evidence-based clinical application of sodium-glucose cotransporter inhibitors: insight to the uncommon cardiovascular disease scenarios in diabetes”. Your suggestions give us the opportunity to improve our paper, and remedy mistakes.

1. Reviewer #1:

General Comments: The manuscript provides an extensive review of clinical trials and meta-analyses related to the efficacy and safety of SGLT inhibitors (SGLTis) in managing various cardiovascular conditions in patients with type 2 diabetes. It offers a thorough overview, integrating data from multiple studies to support the utilization of SGLTis in clinical practice.

Specific Comments: Aim: The aim is clearly defined, providing a concise statement of the research focus. However, the scope could be broadened to explicitly state the intention to evaluate the nonglycemic benefits of SGLTis. Methodology: The methodology section is adequately detailed, yet it could benefit from including specific inclusion and exclusion criteria for the studies reviewed. Results: Results are well-summarized, presenting a balanced view of the current evidence. Nevertheless, it is crucial to address potential publication bias in the studies reviewed, and if possible, to provide quantitative data to support the qualitative synthesis. Conclusion: The conclusion is well-articulated, highlighting the importance of the findings and
suggesting avenues for future research. **It might be helpful to comment on the clinical significance of the results for patient care.** Limitations: The discussion on limitations is transparent, which is commendable. **It is suggested to also consider limitations related to the diversity of patient populations and the generalizability of the results.** Writing Style: The manuscript is mostly well-written but could benefit from careful proofreading to correct minor typographical errors.

**Our Reply:**

**Dear reviewer:**

Thank you very much for your positive feedback and valuable suggestions on our article. The suggestions you raised are very professional and meaningful.

Under the guidance of your revision suggestions, we have read and revised the entire text again. We have refined two articles in the "atrial fibrillation" section, added two latest studies in the "acute myocardial infarction" section, and corrected some spelling and grammar errors. We have provided a more detailed description of the inclusion methods and standards for the article. We have added content on discussing the significance of the results. The revision suggestions you raised regarding the non hypoglycemic effects of SGLTis are very important. We have discussed them in another article titled 'Update on the clinical application of SGLTis: insight to treatment beyond cardiorenal disease'. In addition, as our article is a descriptive review
aimed at providing a comprehensive information on SGLIs with a large dimension and multiple contents, we were unable to provide a quantitative indicator like Meta analysis. We hope to receipt your acceptance.

In addition, we have also added content in the limitations section of the article regarding the impact of patient population diversity on the generalizability of results, as mentioned in your revision suggestions. We hope to have a more objective view of the conclusions drawn in the article.

The above are some modifications and improvements we have made based on your guidance, hoping to gain your approval.

2. Reviewer #2:

This review article is well written and discusses clinically import topic. 

But the main problem is related to language editing and grammar corrections. 

1- All the paragraphs written in yellow-orange clour should be checked by native English speaker. Other paragraphs written in black color could be reduced. The shorter the better. 
2- The abstract contains this abbreviation: SGLTis. The fill name should be written first. The title contains some words written in upper case and others in lower case. Please use one format. Also, in the abstract and core tip, what is primary prevention of atherosclerosis? Is it a new heart disease? 
3- In the abstract and core tip, it is better to change and correct this sentence: In this paper, we concentrate on upgrading clinical research of SGLTis for patients with type 2... Updating is better than upgrading in this context. 
4- In the background section, please correct the
grammar and language errors in this sentence: The use scenarios, which are supported by clear evidence-based medical evidence and recommended by authoritative guidelines, will not be include in this review. 5-In the main conclusions of all tables, please try to reduce the contents. Also, magazine can be changed to journal. The conclusion related to Ferreira JP [18], please correct these sentence: Empagliflozin reduced the primary outcome not significantly different between mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists nonusers and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists users. Also the conclusion related to Voors AA [26]. Please correct this sentence: Empagliflozin is well tolerated and results in significant clinical benefit in patients hospitalized for AHF in the 90 days after starting treatment. Also, related to CarvalhoPEP[31], please correct this conclusion: SGLT2i addition to conventional diuretic therapy reduced all-cause death, readmissions for HF, and the composite of cardiovascular death or readmissions for HF. 6- Some words in the titles of tables are written in Bold. why? 7-Under limitation heading, please rewrite this sentence: According to our review, these materials we enrolled, most studies are subgroup or meta-analyses. There is lacking well-designed, large sample size, and long follow-up studies directly target to these diseases.

Our Reply:

Dear reviewer:

Thank you very much for your positive feedback and valuable suggestions on our article. The questions you raised are of great significance
for us to improve the article.

According to your modification suggestions, we have optimized the language, corrected some grammar errors, replaced inappropriate words, and corrected abbreviations. We have modified the content of the table and streamlined its conclusions. We have corrected the errors you pointed out in the 'Abstract' and 'Limitation' sections and optimized the writing of the article.

The above are some modifications and improvements we have made based on your guidance, hoping to gain your approval.

3. Our reply to the opinions of editors

Dear editors:

Thank you for your revision suggestions of our manuscript. Your suggestions have played a very important role in improving our manuscript. In the revised manuscript, we have made the following modifications based on your suggestions: 1) We have updated the literature search date to April, 6, 2024, added the latest literatures, and included our previous research. 2) We have standardized the references according to the requirements of your magazine, while also refined the number of references. 3) We further polished our language by experienced language expert. 4) We have improved the table and content of the article. Thanks!

Sincerely!
