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Reviewer's report:

General

The major strength of this manuscript is the careful attention and details provided by the authors in the Materials and Methods section. The inclusion/exclusion criteria are well defined as are the definitions for identifying the Cases and Controls.

The description and justification for using the Michigan Neuropathic Diabetic Scoring system is defined nicely by the authors.

I believe that the Discussion is appropriate.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. The first sentence in the Materials and Methods belongs in the Results section.

2. Include p-values in Table 1.

3. Include: Quality of diabetes control (%) for each of the categories of HbA1C control for cases and controls, cigarette smoking (%), ACEI consumption, BP control, distal symmetric sensory motor polyneuropathy (%) and associated p-values in an enlarged Table 1.

4. Add a Table 2 that shows Odds Ratios (p-values and 95% Confidence Intervals) for those variables that were significant either protective for Cases or Controls.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I am not confident that Figure 2 is fully explained by the authors. I need a little more in the Results section.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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