Science Editor, Ying Dou

World Journal of Diabetes

4/11/2019

Subject: Response to Reviewer's Comments

Dear Editor

All comments/suggestions have been addressed and responses are listed below point. The title was also modified slightly as suggested by reviewer. Please find enclosed the edited manuscript entitled '**Are Serum Leptin Levels Predicted by Lipoproteins, Vitamin D and Body Composition?**' (Manuscript NO.: 46338) We have verified the accuracy of general information for our manuscript only the title needs to be changed as suggested by one of the reviewer.

All reviewers' comments have been listed below along with the responses. These changes have been made in the manuscript and highlighted as yellow. Following docs have been submitted except number 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.:

(1) 46338-Edited Manuscript File
(2) 46338-Answering Reviewers
(3) 46338-Audio Core Tip
(4) 46338-Biostatistics Review Certificate
(5) 46338-Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form
(6) 46338-Copyright License Agreement
(7) 46338-Approved Grant Application Form(s) or Funding Agency Copy of any Approval Document(s); not submitted
(8) 46338-Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate. (English is our official language.)
(9) 46338-Video ; not applicable to our study
(10) 46338-Image File not applicable to our study
(11) 46338-PRISMA 2009 Checklist
(12) 46338-Supplementary Material: not applicable to our study

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER (Reviewer's code: 03352142) **COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1. Title should be revised in which from it the manuscript readers can understand that the leptin is response or dependent variable and other variables are predictor; for example as: "are leptin levels predicted by body composition; ….: a cross-sectional study"
   Response to reviewers: The title has been modified to 'Are Serum Leptin Levels Predicted by Lipoproteins, Vitamin D and Body Composition?'

2. I did not find the abstract in the body of manuscript; it should be added.
   Response to reviewers: the abstract has been added in the body of the manuscript.
3. It lacks the keywords:
   Response to reviewers: five keywords have been added.
4. In methods section; the process of sample selection should be expressed; the units of measured variables such as BMI should be presented.
   Response to reviewers: the process of sample selection is restated in the methods section and the units of measured variables like BMI and BIA parameters have been added.
5. All analyzed variables in results section should be introduced carefully in methods section beforehand, R software's version should be presented; all statistical test used in data analysis should be presented in statistical analysis section; how about chi-square for categorical data how about the correlation coefficient such as Pearson or spearman for bivariate correlation analyses? How about the normality evaluation of continuous data? How variables have been presented (categorical and continuous data) in results section it should be declared in statistical analysis subsection; how about the non-parametric test for comparing non-normal data between two groups such as Mann-Whitney U test? the following sentences are wrong and does not have right sense! " ANOVA was used to observe the model fit taking value of 0.000 as statistically significant. Multiple regression analysis was done to explore the relative significance of main independent variables in the prediction of intention." And the next sentences too?!! Statistical analysis subsection needs major revisions; collinearity by which statistical test or index was evaluated? The process of model fitting should be revised and redone for regression analysis as follows : first those variables that have significant association with leptin in univariate analysis at p<0.2 should be entered in multivariable analysis. highly significant is not a correct scientific term! Results: the categories of BMI are as (underweight; normal; over, obese); the p-values should be footnoted at the below tables that which statistical tests are based. Which regression coefficient was used in table 2, it should be introduced in statistical analysis subsection, the process of regression modeling according to my above comments should be reconsidered and those predictors that are significant in univariate or have p<0.2 should be entered in multivariable; the regression coefficients should be interpreted more carful and correctly they needs major revisions; the regression coefficient for BMR is 0??!!!the presented results for gender is not significant the confidence interval contain zero?!!! Collinearity diagnostic criterial in table 3 are not needed; although I see some indication of it VIF>5! Ethical approval and study project number should be presented;
6. Response to reviewers: All analyzed variables in results section have been revised and carefully added in methods section. R software's version has been added in the manuscript. All statistical test used in data analysis is now

presented in statistical analysis section. Details of chi-square for categorical data and the Pearson correlation coefficient for bivariate correlation analyses has been added in the manuscripts section of statistical analysis. The normality evaluation of continuous data was evaluated and we have added 25OHD and leptin were log transformed before running correlation and regression analysis. For non-parametric test comparison between two groups Mann-Whitney U test was applied and is now mentioned in stats section. The following sentences which dinot make sense have been deleted: " ANOVA was used to observe the model fit taking value of 0.000 as statistically significant. Multiple regression analysis was done to explore the relative significance of main independent variables in the prediction of intention. We did follow the steps for regression analysis as stated by you and have revised the results and tables accordingly: first Univariate analysis was done, those variables that had significant association with leptin in univariate analysis at $p<0.2$ were entered in multivariable analysis. As pointed out by you we have deleted the term 'highly significant'. The p-values have been footnoted below the 3 tables

Univariate analysis was conducted in table 2 and this information has been added below the table and also introduced in statistical analysis subsection. Regression analysis was carefully reconsidered, stats section was accordingly revised as suggested by you and results revised where needed.We have not removed the collinearity diagnostic criteria from table 3 as we feel it is providing some important added information. Ethical approval number has been added in the manuscript and highlighted as yellow.

RESPNSE TO EDITORIAL REVIEW (WITH REFERENCE TO EDITED DOC)

1. Audio core tip: In order to attract readers to read your full-text article, we request that the author make an audio file describing your final core tip, it is necessary for final acceptance. Please refer to Instruction to authors on our website or attached Format for detailed information. The accepted formats are mp3 or wma.
   Response to reviewer: Audio core tip is added
2. Please provide the decomposable figure of Figures, whose parts are movable and editable. So you can put the original pictures in PPT and submit it in the system.
   Response to reviewer: No figures are included in our submission.
3. Your manuscript should be prepared with Word-processing Software, using 12 pt Book Antiqua font and 1.5 line spacing with ample margins.
   Response to reviewer: Manuscript has been prepared with word using 12 pt book antiqua font and 1.5 line space
4. Provide Running title
   Response to reviewer: Running title has been provided
5. Please provide the author contributions
   Response to reviewer: Author contribution has been provided in the format shared.
6. Provide PRISMA 2009 Checklist statement:

Response to reviewer: PRISMA 2009 Checklist statement has been submitted separately on the form available on journal website.

7. Please provide: Corresponding author, Telephone, Fax:
   Response to reviewer: details of corresponding author fax and phone number are provided as laid down by reviewer.

8. Add structured abstract
   Response to reviewer: a well structured abstract has been added taking care of the suggestions by reviewer.

9. Please add 5¬10 key words here words that could reflect content of the study mainly from Index Medicus
   Response to reviewer: 5 key words have been added from index medicus

10. Please write a summary of less than 100 words to outline the most innovative and important arguments and core contents in your paper to attract readers.
    Response to reviewer: core tip has been added.

11. Please provide all authors abbreviation names and manuscript title here. *World J Diabetes* 2019; In press
    Response to reviewer: All authors abbreviation names and manuscript title have been added as suggested.

12. Please modify the referenced references in this format.
    Response to reviewer: All references are now in new format and cited as superscripts in the manuscript as suggested.

13. Statistical significance is expressed as $^aP < 0.05$, $^bP < 0.01$ ($P > 0.05$ usually does not need to be denoted). If there are other series of P values, $^cP < 0.05$ and $^dP < 0.01$ are used, and a third series of P values is expressed as $^eP < 0.05$ and $^fP < 0.01$.
    Response to reviewer: Corrections have been made and p values >0.05 are not denoted.

14. Please write one section according to below suggestive question, for ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS *Research background Research motivation Research objectives*: *Research methods Research results Research conclusions Research perspectives*
    Response to reviewer: All above sections have been added in the manuscript.\

15. Please check and confirm that there are no repeated references. Please add PubMed citation numbers (**PMID** NOT PMCID) and DOI citation to the reference list and list all authors. Please revise throughout.
    Response to reviewer: There are no repeat references. We have added PubMed citation numbers in all references and also and DOI citation to the reference list. We have also listed **all authors.**

16. Please don't include abbreviations in the title of the figure/table.
    Response to reviewer: None of the tables have any titles with abbreviations.

17. Please explain all the abbreviations in the figure/table legends: full name (abbreviation). Please explain all the abbreviations of each figure/table under each piece of figure/table legends.

Response to reviewer: All abbreviations were already explained under the 3 tables.

18. Please don't include any *, #, ...in your manuscript; Please use superscript numbers for illustration; and for statistical significance, please use superscript letters.

Response to reviewer: All *, #, ...have been deleted from manuscript; Superscript numbers are used for illustration; and for statistical significance superscript is used.

Thanks and Regards
Dr Lena Jafri
Corresponding author