

1 Reviewer response

2 Manuscript ID: 67918

3 The present cross-sectional study aims to examine the association between adherence to the Mediterranean
4 diet (MD) and advanced glycation endproducts (AGEs), measured using AGE Reader, in 273 adult patients
5 with diabetes mellitus (DM) type II. Although this is an interesting study, with the results beneficial for both
6 the research community and clinicians, there are certain changes that need to be made and concerns
7 addressed.

8 Dear reviewer, thank you for reading and correcting of our manuscript. We are glad to inform you that we
9 have now made the changes you proposed and we hope that our paper will now suitable for publication.

10 Atherosclerosis is not the most appropriate key word for the present study. The authors should consider
11 replacing the aforementioned key word with the one more relevant.

12 Dear reviewer, we appreciate your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

13 The abbreviations are not used correctly. All abbreviations should be defined on the place of its first
14 appearance in all the following sections: Abstract, Core tip, Main text of the manuscript, Tables, and Figures.
15 This is a problem throughout the paper so authors should go through the manuscript carefully and make
16 appropriate corrections. All the abbreviations used in Tables should be defined in the table footnotes so that
17 each table is understood as an independent unit.

18 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved, as we thoroughly revised
19 abbreviations used.

20 Authors should consider including initial hypotheses into the Introduction section, after the aims of the study.

21 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. We have now included the main hypotheses into the
22 Introduction section.

23 In the Information consent statement the authors wrote that written consents were provided from study
24 participants or their legal guardians. For how many participants were informed consents provided by their
25 legal guardians? In those cases, did both the participants and their legal guardians provide written consents?
26 If this is the case, the authors should discuss it in Materials and Methods section.

27 Dear reviewer, thank you for this observation. In the present study, all participants personally provided
28 written consents, as no underage participants were included.

29 The authors should consider adding the information on a number of patients assessed for eligibility and
30 calculate the overall acceptance rate. The aforementioned should be added to Subjects section of Materials
31 and Methods.

32 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. We initially screened 347 patients. 19 patients were excluded
33 because their DM type II diagnosis was established in the past year, 37 patients were excluded because they
34 had DM type I, whereas 10 patients were excluded because they had other types of DM. Finally, among 281
35 eligible patients, 8 refused to participate in the study. Overall acceptance rate was 97%. We have now added
36 this part to Materials and methods section.

37 Have the authors calculated the sample size before the study start? The procedure of sample size calculation
38 should be explained in the Materials and Methods section.

39 Dear reviewer, thank you for this observation. We performed sample size analysis, which was calculated
40 using MedCalc software. We used estimated difference in the proportion of the adherence to MD of 0.1,
41 with α error set at 0.05 and study power of 90%. Calculated sample size was 158 participants. To ensure
42 additional power to the study, we collected substantially larger sample of diabetes patients.

43 The authors should explain how the neck circumference was measured in the Anthropometric measurements
44 section. The information on the instrument used for the measurement of waist, hip, and neck circumferences
45 should also be added, together with the level of precision for all the performed anthropometric
46 measurements.

47 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

48 To make the reading of the manuscript easier, authors should not duplicate the results already present in the
49 Tables. For the results already present in the Tables, it should be enough to keep only the significant
50 differences in the text.

51 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. Only significant differences are kept in the text now.

52 The authors should consider deleting the Figure 1 because all the important data from the figure are already
53 written in the text of the Results section.

54 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. We have now removed the Figure 1.

55 line 279: "Table S1" should be "Table 4"

56 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

57 line 276: the percentages reported are not consistent with the data reported in Table 4

58 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. We have wrongly placed data from Table 2. This has now been
59 resolved.

60 In the Discussion section authors should further discuss their opinion on a relatively low adherence to the
61 Mediterranean diet in the studied population and compare the results with those of other studies conducted
62 on the same population group. Authors should also discuss what is in their opinion the reason for
63 significantly higher values of AGEs in men when compared to women.

64 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment, we have now discussed these results.

65 Among the aims of the study the association between physical activity and AGEs is mentioned. The authors
66 should discuss the obtained results in the Discussion section.

67 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. We have now discussed this part.

68 In the Discussion section (line 390) it is essential to specify the type of meat authors are referring to.

69 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. We have no specified that this section is with regard to red
70 meat.

71

72 Minor comments:

73 The authors should be consistent and use the term DM type II throughout the manuscript. Please replace
74 “type 2 diabetes” and “diabetes type 2” with “DM type II” in lines 159 and 163.

75 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

76 In Table 1 please correct “kg/m2” to “kg/m²”

77 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

78 Authors should insert the unit for HbA1c in the Table 1.

79 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

80 In Tables 2, 3, and 4 it should be sufficient to insert “(N, %)” after Parameter and not after each single food
81 item.

82 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

83 Please bold or highlight somehow all statistically significant P-values in all the Tables and add appropriate
84 explanation into the footnotes.

85 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

86 Although the manuscript is well-written and easy to follow, there are some minor errors that need to be
87 corrected.

88 line 86: “amon” should be changed to “among”

89 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

90 line 131: “measuremnt” should be changed to “measurement”

91 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

92 line 133: "...the degree of CV risk patients with DM" should be changed to "...the degree of CV risk in
93 patients with DM"

94 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

95 line 187: "...consisted of 7 items that include..." should be changed to "...consisted of 7 items that
96 included..."

97 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

98 line 280: "...that MDSS score have significant..." should be changed to "...that MDSS score has
99 significant..."

100 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

101 line 360: the word "compared" is written twice

102 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

103 lines 370 and 384: "disesase" should be changed to "disease"

104 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.

105 Table 7: "If educational programs on nutrition exist in ..." should be changed to "If educational programs on
106 nutrition existed in ..."

107 Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment. This issue has now been resolved.