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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors, this is an interesting paper comparing two diet quality indices in measuring diet quality of a diabetic population and its effect on therapeutic targets. I commend the authors for the used design. However, consider revising the results/analysis in the following way:

1. Table 1 and 2 seem necessary as you could refer to the actual indices and cite their journal articles.

2. Instead, Table 3 could also show the characteristics of participants by lowest and highest quintile/tertile scores on the two diet quality indices.

3. Perhaps also a table actually showing the food group servings/d and mean energy, nutrient intakes of participants with type 2 diabetes could highlight their diets irrespective of the diet quality scores to get a picture of what the participants diets actually look like in terms of average adult requirements and what they are eating.

4. May be a table showing differences in daily nutrient and food intakes of selected nutrients and foods according to the diet quality index quintile/tertile scores.

5. Perhaps run additional sub-analyses adjusting for other con-founders such as hypertension and high cholesterol. What about the effect of removing BMI from the final model? Perhaps an analysis stratified by measured BMI?

6. Were the analyses based upon energy-adjusted nutrient intake and did it include some major con-founders to the diet quality and does it assess the "long-term" intake? If not and without number 5, it is important that the paper doesn't over state the results.
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