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Reviewer's report:

Most of my review and suggestions are in the pdf document attached, for authors to refer and revise. The notes below are some addition and may overlap. Mostly are minor essential revisions.

Suggest shorten the Title: Poor glycaemic control in younger women attending Malaysian public primary care clinics: findings from Adults Diabetes Control and Management registry

Abstract: Suggest to shorten the Background; to omit the first 3 lines.

Introduction:
Minor changes in attached document. Highlighted yellow - to omit; text in blue to add or replace

Materials and Methods:
1. This paper merely extracted data from a registry as explained in "Study design", hence the first paragraph of "Data collection" was not appropriate; suggest authors to add "refer to previous published paper of ADCM"

2. Suggest to focus & describe on "what data/variable that have been extracted from the registry" and define them.

3. For definition of Reproductive, data on status of pre- and post-menopause would be more accurate than just the age.
Did you exclude pregnancy? how? Need to add a description of this if the registry actually exclude pregnant women during the data entry level.

4. ALL Data were from a Diabetes Registry, hence definition for "patients with T2D" was redundant in this paper. Suggest omit.

Results:

5. Reason for exclusion? Range of age for the 2 groups is important to determine the variance

6. Table 1 suggest to rename: Demographic and co-morbidity of women in the reproductive and non-reproductive groups. Table 2: Clinical parameters....
3: OHA not used in the table but explained at the bottom?

None of the total of reproductive women equal to 6632 or non-reproductive equal to 23795 as mentioned in the text, not even the demographic data. I assumed it was due to missing data which should be mentioned at least in the text if not in the tables.

Discussion:

7. page 12; line 2 from discussion to page 13; first 2 lines - should be in "Introduction" (in brackets)

8. page 14: first paragraph - Issue of sub-optimum treatment with both OHA and insulins should be included in the discussion.

9. Abbreviation use should be consistent, e.g. OHA or AHA

10. Conclusion: Except for the first sentence, the other sentences need to be replaced as those were not the conclusion from this paper, but recommendation. Please revise.

11. Statement of ethics approval from the respective body not described.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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