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Reviewer's report:

This is well presented study however, some items should be addressed to ensure that readers will glean the most from the manuscript:

Minor essential revisions:

1. Use of the term "study arms" on page 5 is misleading, as that is what is commonly used to describe treatment groups in an intervention study/clinical trial. Suggest removing or revising

2. When using Cox Proportional Hazards models, the Proportional Hazards Assumption must be checked and satisfied. Was this done? If so, please state that it was.

3. Although the controls were matched to cases on age and sex, what about other possible confounders, i.e. geographic region?

4. When reporting the results of the Cox models, it is not correct to state "adjusted rates" as this is not what appears to be calculated. It is correct to report the rates and show the significance of the variables within the Cox models but these rates are not adjusted - what is adjusted is the hazard ratio. Please clarify

5. Although it is stated that this is a "large insured population with sufficient size to quantify and compare the incidence rates of MI or CVA in patients with DME against matched diabetes controls" - Is there evidence to prove that this study has greater power than previous studies? Please address in discussion

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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