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Re: MS#7287453032765582 – Perceived Body Image in Men and Women with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Correlation of Body mass Index with the Figure Rating Scale

Nutrition Journal Editorial Team:

Thank you for the additional reviewer comments on our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript in accord with the reviewers’ comments and provide a detailed explanation below of how the manuscript has been revised and how we have addressed each of the reviewers’ comments. We look forward to hearing from you regarding the revised manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

1. General: I think it is important to point out that a high correlation between BMI and body image figure does not necessarily mean that participants’ perceptions are close to their actual BMI as suggested throughout the paper and discussed in the conclusion. … Thus, I just would like to provide caution when interpreting the correlation.

RESPONSE: Additional information has been added to the Discussion section (page 10, top of page) to provide the caution that the reviewer mentioned.

2. The response does help to clarify the approach. There is still concern about error and bias utilizing this approach. However, the approach is now clear.

RESPONSE: The potential for error and bias have been addressed in the limitations noted in the Discussion section of the manuscript.

3. The response does clarify that participants were not clustered which lessens my concern about the analysis approach not employing GEE modeling. If the true goal of the study was to look at correlations between BMI and body image stratified by T2DM status, then this approach accomplishes that. However, it does not take potential confounders into consideration at all, which is why a more sophisticated modeling approach was suggested. This may be something that the statistician would like to revisit and reevaluate as was done with the type of correlation reported (Spearman versus Pearson). Confidence in the results may be increased with additional statistical review.
We would like to reiterate that the goal of the study was to examine the correlation between BMI and body image stratified by T2DM status and concur with the reviewer that “this approach accomplishes that”. However, we did construct an ordered logistic regression model adjusting for age, gender, race, education and income. The regression analysis indicates a significant association between the Figure Rating Scale and BMI (p<0.0001) with one unit increase in BMI, the odds of a rating scale score of 2-9 is 1.38 times higher than a score of 1 given all the other variables are held constant. The regression technique and results have been added to the methods and results.

4. There are still several places in the manuscript in which body “image” is used to refer to the figure. For example, “study measures” paragraph 1 and “results” paragraph 2.

RESPONSE: The wording has been changed to note figure instead of image.

5. To clarify, I was not referring to references for BMI and disease since that is not the argument of this sentence. A reference should be added to support that “BMI and FRS are useful to assess the relationship of body weight to adverse clinical outcomes.”

RESPONSE: References have been added to support this sentence in the first paragraph of the Introduction.

6. Introduction paragraph 1: “assessed” should be changed to “estimated.” Saying assessed implies that body fat was measured.

RESPONSE: The wording has been changed as suggested by the reviewer.

We thank the reviewers again for their careful review of our manuscript. The revisions described above have helped strengthen and clarify the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Kathleen M. Fox, PhD
Corresponding Author