

20th December 2018

Dr Jia-Ping Yan
Science Editor
Editorial Office

Dear Sir

Many thanks for giving us the opportunity for rewriting of our manuscript 44671. We also thank you for extending the submission deadline.

We have replied to the queries raised and peer review report. There is a conflict in edited manuscript comment No 24 and comment of reviewer 00058696 who suggests splitting table 1 into 2 tables as 1A and 1B. We have redone the tables according to reviewer's suggestion.

We hope you will give us a favorable decision at the earliest.

Best regards

Dr Suvarna Patil
Medical Director
BKL walawalkar Hospital and Rural medical collegW

Reply to edited manuscript and Peer review report

Edited manuscript- File 44671-Edited

Reply to Comment 2: Post codes have been provided

Reply to Comment 3: Post codes have been provided

Reply to Comment 4: ORCID number for all the authors have been provided

Reply to Comment 5: Author contributions have been reported

Reply to Comment 6: Institutional review board statement has been added.

Reply to Comment 7: Informed consnt statement has been added

Reply to Comment 8: STROBE statement has been added.

Reply to Comment 9: Telephone and Fax number has been added

Reply to Comment 10: *BACKGROUND* has been added

Reply to Comment 11: Core tip has been added.

Reply to Comment 12: Audio Core tip has been provided.

Reply to Comment 13: This has been corrected

Reply to Comment 14: Rephrasing has been done

Reply to Comment 15: Rephrasing has been done.

Reply to Comment 16: Rephrasing has been done

Reply to Comment 17: Rephrasing has been done

Reply to Comment 18: Rephrasing has been done

Reply to Comment 19: Rephrasing has been done.

Reply to Comment 20: Rephrasing has been done.

Reply to Comment 21: Guidelines suggested have been considered while revising the manuscript.

Reply to Comment 22: PMID, DOI have been incorporated

Reply to Comment 23: Abbreviations have been detailed out

Reply to Comment 24: We took reviewer 00058696's suggestion regarding splitting the table 1 in to 1A (For continuous data) and 1B (For categorical data)

Reply to Comment 25: Abbreviations have been detailed out

Reply to PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Reviewer 03465354

We thank the reviewer for his/her overall appreciation of our study despite some limitations.

Reviewer 02446627

We appreciate the reviewer's appreciation of the selected population despite limitations.

The concerns raised by the reviewer about the validity of the analyzer are correct but similar concerns have been raised in the past. We have incorporated this in our limitations discussion and have added the references for these 2 reports(Ref No 45 & 46) from India sighting concerns but which also have emphasized the urgent need to develop ethnicity specific equation for Asian Indian population. As we have admitted in the manuscript we could not use Dual Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry (DEXA), the current gold standard for body composition because of the high equipment costs and opted for TANITA analyzer.

We have inappropriately used the term genetic predisposition which suggests the availability of genetic data which we do not have. We have rewritten this. (Page 7)

Reviewer 00506276

1)As suggested we have relocated the text about inclusion/exclusion criteria to Methods section. (Page 3, end of Methods section)

2) We have specified now that gender difference in proportion of family history of diabetes was only for diabetic subjects. (page 3, section 3.1, line being Table 1B-----)

3) We forgot to put % which has been corrected now (paragraph3.2, line 2)

4) We agree with the reviewer that the finding that higher muscle mass was observed in diabetic vs non-diabetic males is unexpected . But this could be a chance finding and may be due to wide difference in sample numbers 102 male diabetics vs 68 male non-diabetics.

Reviewer 00058696

1) We have taken reviewer's suggestion on board and added the sentence in the conclusion section of the abstract.

2) Our study was not hypothesis driven. Though lean diabetes has been described earlier even in other parts of India as described in paragraph 3, the path which led us to investigate this phenomenon in KOKAN region is very different. We have expanded on this in paragraph 4. Our subsequent studies will be more intense and hypothesis driven based on the current findings.

3) We appreciate reviewers suggestion on amino acids and pancreatic disease. But we would like to clarify that pancreatic disease

4) We do not have any genetic data. We also have not documented consanguinity in our subjects.

5) We have done the age adjustment in comparison of anthropometric data but missed to mention it. We have incorporated this in the legend for the table 1A. Body composition data is already age adjusted.

6) We have taken the reviewers suggestion into account and split the table 1 into table 1A and table 1B.

Reviewers question regarding major difference in men and women regarding microvascular complications:

This may be due to social and cultural practice in this area. Women are not preferred in the society and there is a male dominance across the board in this area. Someone with male gender having diabetic complication is reported to the hospital at the earliest. But lot of women suffer from complications at home. They are brought to the hospital only when things get very complicated.

Minor questions

1) The spelling of substantial has been corrected.

2) Results line 2: "and" has been added after chronic illness. Please note that this appears in inclusion exclusion section which has been moved to the end of the Methods section as per Reviewer 00506276's suggestion.

3) Results paragraph 2 : Text changes as per suggestion

Sentence 4 : Text changed as per suggestion

Sentence 6: Text changes as per suggestion.

4) Line-4 This sentence has been rewritten.

Line-28 Text has been changed as per suggestion and also been rewritten a bit.

Sentence starting ;Visceral fat(VF)....." has been rewritten citing appropriate references.