

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and the comments. All changes are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript to facilitate editorial reassessment.

Some of the statements made in abstract and introduction looks same. Revise the statements

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We have made the appropriate corrections in the text.

Abstract should be more quantitative as possible, in order to favour the interest of the paper and for rapid comparison with other papers.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. Changes have been made according to your comment.

For instance: a) referring to the number of the papers published in the different areas of impact and therefore demonstrating that some areas like the one associated with dementia or/and sexual dysfunction and with smaller number of papers but they are growing. Nevertheless, it is missing the coronary arterial disease not related with risk factors (genetic, the weight of bird, or others). If the authors, feels fair please include these in the paper.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The numbers of papers have been added.

Please, also avoid no quantitative or scientific terms like tsunami...to describe and quantify a biological phenomena....and as possible and wherever adequate use absolute values (even for HDL or LDL, or biochemical parameters to ascertain for specific pathologic situations (and we know that WHO change it every decade, or less), for rapid comparison with others studies and reviews.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The terms referred above have been erased. Absolute values were written .

Therefore I might suggested that at the introduction the authors include reference to the number of papers in the field for instance in the last 5 years in order to demonstrate the difference of papers at the different topics of research that the authors described in this very nice work around the world and also in order to show the areas with less papers but with nevertheless of growing interest.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The numbers of papers have been added and areas of interest have been shown.

The references regarding the coexistence of depression and diabetes has drawn researcher's attention are good but could be refresh in terms of actuality. In the last 5 years many studies have been performed with metabolic control and diabetes in many other processes and complications, such as using certain immunossupressors and also certain type of antidepressives drugs (see for instance, MJ Pereira, J Palming, et al ...Molecular and cellular endocrinology 355 (1), 96-105) were demonstrated to induce metabolism dysfunction associated with diabetes. The authors should also referred to similar and others studies from the last 2 or 3 years, in order to improve the paper and present it properly with recent data (even from 2015 and 2016), for instance from authors such as: Jan Erikson, Ulf Smith, etc, also showing a biochemical angle of these phenomena by studying and using human adipocytes and the effects of these drugs on the onset of diabetes. Therefore, it would turn this review more sound and solid if the authors would increase the percentage of references from the last 2-3 years, even from 2016, at least 20% of the total references, and not only about 5%.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. Thirteen new references (written in 2015 and 2016) have been added to reach the percentage of recent articles demanded. Respective additions to text have been made in the research areas indicated..