Corrections and answers

Referee number - 02623966

It is an interesting manuscript. Authors succeed to present their data in a clear way adding information to the existing literature. Therefore, I have no corrections to do and the manuscript can be published unaltered.

Answer-

Thank you for your comments.

Referee number – 05040445

In the present study, the authors tried to investigate the relationship between diabetic polyneuropathy, serum visfatin and oxidative stress biomarkers. My comments are as follow: 1. Intruduction: too long and much about DN basic information, I suggest the author make it shorter and only focus on the importance of what will be done; 2.Method: they said they randomly chosen the patient but how? they didn't give the basic data of the patients which is very important. for example, what about the use of diabetic medication? long time use of metformin have been reported to correlated DN or B12 deficency. and what about other complications and diseases that combination with diabetes? I suggest the author could quartilize the data according to visfatin or other important oxidative biomarkers to see if this correlated with the seriousness of DN by trend chi-square test? 3. The discussion should focus on the results.

Answer-

Thank you for your comments.

1. The introduction is organized and focused on key issues related to the study.
2. In the method section, the inclusion criteria of patients are detailed. The reason why patients cannot be evaluated in detail about diabetes treatments is

explained. The reason for the lacking information including Vitamin B12deficiency and the other complications and diseases that combination with diabetes is explained. For the seriousness of DN, we did not make an additional assessment other than examination scoring. The total MNSI score was pointed over 10 points and the score ≥ 2.5 was accepted as abnormal. There is no separate categorization method for the scores above 2.5 in the MNSI evaluation scale. For this reason, we did not have the chance to compare the data by quartilizing in that way.

3. The discussion section corrected by focusing on the results.

Referee number – 02904354

The paper format and organization should be greatly improved. The introduction section is long, and it can be shortened. Results were confusing. Give subheading titles in the Results section to more clearly demonstrate your results. Figures 1-6 can be combined into a whole figure. Language and grammar errors are frequent and should be improved.

Thank you for your comments.

Answer –

1- The introduction section was shortened.

2- The results section was arranged clearly and appropriately.

3- Figures 1-6 were combined into a whole figure.

4- Language and grammar errors were improved.

The answer for additional comment

1- The manuscript was prepared with Word-processing Software, using 12 pt Book Antiqua font and 1.5 line spacing with ample margins.

2- "Institutional Review Board Approval Form" files are qualified.

3- PDF version of the Copyright License Agreement Form was uploaded that has been signed by all authors.

4- Duplicated parts according to the CrossCheck report was reorganized.

5- For providing the decomposable figure of Figures, whose parts are movable and editable' I tried to edit. I made the arrangements for the last revision. As you know, due to COVID-19, we have been working different shifts at the hospital and I don't have acces the orginal document to re-edit. This document was given to me by Uysal O, assistant professor, bioistatistics, and only he has acces to it. I have been trying to get a hold of him with no luck.

All data in the figures are detailed in the article.