

Author's response to reviews

Title: A Whey Protein Supplement Decreases Post-prandial Glycemia

Authors:

Brent L Petersen (bpetersen@glanbiausa.com)
Loren S Ward (lward@glanbiausa.com)
Eric D Bastian (ebastian@glanbiausa.com)
Alexandra L Jenkins (alexandrajenkins@gilabs.com)
Janice Campbell (jcampbell@gilabs.com)
Vladimir Vuksan (vladimir.vuksan@utoronto.ca)

Version: 2 **Date:** 11 August 2009

Author's response to reviews: see over

Reply to reviewers

Reviewer 1:

1. This study included 7 women. Did they have regular menstrual cycle? Were glucose test performed during follicular, luteal or in both phases? Please discuss this aspect.

This is a good point and this will have contributed to the variation in response. Unfortunately these data were not collected, hopefully the randomization of the test meals and the different times of the cycle of the women controlled for a possible effect of phase on glucose tolerance status. Although the samples size was really too small, there nevertheless did not seem to be a difference in the glucose response between the women and men.

2. Control was run twice. Which value was used for analysis, first, second, both or average. Please mention that and report intra-individual CV and intraclass coefficient of correlation.

The mean of the two tests were used in the data analysis. This sentence has been added into the method section. The intra-class coefficient of variation of the two tests was 28.3% and the intra-class coefficient of correlation was 17.9%, this has been added to the result section.

3. Only after looking Figure 1 is clear that SE was used. Please indicate that in the method section.

Thank you, the following sentence has been added to the statistical analysis section: All data are expressed as Mean±SEM.

4. Please show the correlation plot between protein dose and glucose AUC. You can still show the current figure 1.

We have replaced fig 2 with the correlation plot.

5. It would be interesting to see the relationship between the glucose AUC control/20g ratio and BMI. I understand this was not the goal of the study, but still may be relevant to show that.

This is an interesting concept – indeed there seemed to be a positive correlation between the ratio and BMI, suggesting that the higher the BMI, the greater the reduction in iAUC. However the correlation was not significant and we have therefore not included it in the paper.

5. Conclusion in abstract section. Please indicate "oral" before glucose bolus.

Thank you, this was done.

6. What was the arginine content? I understand that arginine also enhances insulin secretion.

Arginine has now been included in the table.

Reviewer 2

1. The authors state that they contributed equally to the research. This is difficult to believe, and I suspect that the journal requires more detail – what did the each author specifically contribute to the research carried out.

Thank you – we have provided more details on each author's contribution: BLP, LSW, EDB, ALJ and VV were involved in the experimental design and manuscript preparation. JC and ALJ were responsible for overseeing the clinical trial. ALJ and VV were responsible for the statistical analysis and interpretation of the data.

2. Table 1. Are the numbers listed under 20g of GILP correct? To this reviewer there appears to be a multiplication error; the amounts listed are 1.5 times greater, when going from 10g to 20g, should the amounts not be doubled?

Thank you, this was indeed incorrect – we have corrected the amounts.

3. Conflicts of interests should be clearly stated.

We have added the following sentences: BLP, LSW and EDB are employees of Glanbia Nutritionals. ALJ, VV and JC had no competing interests.

Minor Essential

4. Should be “amylose” not “amylase”, in paragraph 1 (last sentence) of the introduction.

This has been corrected in the text.