

Response to Reviewer 2

Dear Reviewer 2, thank you for our kind revision and for accepting the revised version of our manuscript. The academic Editor asked us to better elucidate your doubt about the significant level adopted in the study. Therefore, we made some changes to clarify this issue, as follows:

In the new reviewed version of the manuscript, we tried to make it clearer that the significance level of $p < 0.10$ were considered only during a pre-selection of independent variables to be included in the multiple regression models tested. To better support this less rigorous pre-selection step often applied for statistician practicing we added a reference reviewing and recommending the selection of variables for linear regression models (lines 206-210; highlighted version). Once included in the multiple regression model, these independent variables were then used to predict each dependent variable by adopting a significance level of 5% ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, we did not use $p < 0.10$ but $p < 0.05$ to choose the multiple regression models with the best combination of two or more independent variables from different groups that could explain the dependent variable in question (FBG, HbA1c, HOMA-IR, and HOMA-Beta) (lines 218-221; highlighted version). Also, we adopted a significance level of 5% ($p < 0.05$) to evaluate glycemic outcomes affected by the independent variables – alone or within its groups (food consumption, metabolites, intestinal microbiota). This information was included in the reviewed manuscript (lines 203-205; highlighted version).