Dear Editor,

thank you for allowing us to provide a second revision.

Regards
Rafael Mikolajczyk

Response to reviewer’s comments

We corrected the sentence on page 7 and 15. No further errors were identified in the table. We adopted the suggestion regarding female gender.

With respect to interactions, we added "p<0.05" to indicate that the test is based on significance testing:

"In the multivariate analysis (joint analysis for all domains) several interactions including group status (diabetic patients vs. controls) and age were significant (p<0.05) (Table 4)."

In fact we performed the analysis in the way suggested by the reviewer, testing the significance of the interaction term. Only significant interaction terms were included in the final model as stated in the legend for Tab 4. We slightly modified the statement in the method section to make it clearer:

"Based on the final model we calculated the contribution of interactions to the HRQOL with Wald-type confidence intervals, comparing to a single reference category for all strata."

We think that the effects of interaction can be well assessed from the presented data. Significance is the function of the effect and sample size. The effect and its uncertainty can approximately be seen in Tab. 4, differences of about 10 points are significant in the given sample, smaller differences could be detected in larger samples (provided they are meaningful enough to be detected).