

We are very grateful for the constructive and positive comments of Reviewer 1 that have substantially improved the quality of our manuscript. We are also very grateful to the Science Editor and Company Editor-in-Chief for the opportunity to improve our manuscript to reconsider it for publication. Next, we respond point by point to the comments made to the manuscript by Reviewer 1.

In this Editorial, Cortés-Rojo C et al. provide a comment on the treatment of diabetes with Mitochondria targeting. The title of the MS is very nice and in general, the MS is a well-written and timely hypothesis. Clarification of a few points, as listed below, would be helpful in order to boost the clarity and impact of this MS. The abstract of editorial is not comprehensive and concise (more than 450 words). The authors should follow the author's instruction <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/214> that suggest no more than 200 words Key words and core-tips are interesting. However the legend of the figure is long that should be concise.

1. The abstract of editorial is not comprehensive and concise (more than 450 words). The authors should follow the author's instruction <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/214> that suggest no more than 200 words

R. Thank you for drawing our attention to this error on our part to follow the editorial guidelines. We have shortened the abstract to 172 words, making it more concise and comprehensive of all aspects addressed in the manuscript.

2. Key words and core-tips are interesting. However the legend of the figure is long that should be concise.

R. We fully agree with the observation that the legend in Figure 1 is too long. We have shortened it from 276 words to 125 words, making it more concise by giving a brief description of all aspects of the Figure.