Reviewer's report

Title: Diet quality scores beyond the Mediterranean Diet and depression in the SUN Project.

Version: 3  Date: 8 July 2015

Reviewer: Allison Hodge

Reviewer's report:

The authors have improved on the original in addressing reviewers comments but there are still some things that could be better.

Minor essential
In the abstract conclusion the concept of nutrient deficiencies does not follow from what is written in the results. The way the results are described could be clearer, especially for the analyses using just the baseline diet and for MDS, it seems there was a threshold effect so that although there was a lower risk of depression in Q2-Q5 relative to Q1, there was not much extra benefit after Q2.

When describing the MDS explain the way the categories are grouped to maintain even numbers in the groups as done in response to reviewers.

Page 21. ‘Less important reductions in risk of depression’ is not an appropriate way to describe this.

As above, the description of the shape of the curves in Fig 1 could be better so the idea of correcting a nutrient deficiency between Q1 and Q2 then little further benefit was easier to understand

Discretionary
The new title seems clumsy and not quite clear.

In line 6 of the intro replace ‘nutritional quality’ with ‘nutrition’.

Is PREDIMED the only study that has used the PDP?

Page 13 describes a ‘linear’ relationship between MDS and depression but elsewhere you argue for an L-shaped association.

P14, still the description of the residual analysis in Table 4 is not very clear.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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