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Reviewer's report:

I read the revision by Dr. Rodriguez-Poncelas and others. The authors have responded to the majority of my concerns, and their manuscript is stronger as a result. I still have additional concerns to improve this manuscript:

Major Revisions:
Comment 1: The following statement is not supported in the results “Decreased GFR and increased UACR … are independent of each other”. The authors should include both GFR and albumin (with or without interaction terms there) as model 4 in their table 4 for this point.

Minor Revisions:
Comment 2: Figures 1 and 2 have reported both prevalence (which implies a percent) and odds ratio. The authors should instead label it as Prevalence Odds Ratio (95% CI) of CVD, and should also include the confidence intervals for each plot. Also, since 1 is the reference (for an OR), a bar graph starting at 0 is not very meaningful. The stock option in excel is a good option for formatting.

Comment 3: Please make sure that all tables are included in the main manuscript, and not in supplemental files.

Comment 4: The grammar has improved, but there are several continued issues:
A) This sentence still needs to be reworded in the abstract “The decreased GFR and increased UACR are risk factors that increase the prevalence of CVD in patients with T2DM, and these factors are independent each other known cardiovascular risk factors.” This should instead match the conclusions, “Decreased GFR and increased UACR are risk factors that increase the prevalence of CVD in patients with T2DM, and these factors are independent of each other and of other known cardiovascular risk factors.”
B) GFR should be changed to eGFR (estimated GFR)
C) Change mil to ml or mL
D) remove “.0” before cholesterol
E) Please replace “,” with “.” In tables 2 and 4
F) Replace table 3 “between interactions” with “between interactions”

Discretionary Revisions:
Comment 5: The acronym CVRF is used only twice. Since this is a nonstandard abbreviation and is used infrequently, the authors should consider omitting it.

Thank you for the revisions.
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