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In response to reviewer R khandekar

Abstract

Introduction

* # 1 Agreed and fixed
* # 2 Agreed and fixed

Methods

* # 1 It is already mentioned that no registry exists for diabetes in the UAE and therefore systematic random sampling was the only procedure for randomization since the full sampling frame is unknown. More elaboration to the sampling methods has been added to the text.

Conclusion

* # 1 Agreed and fixed in the text.

Introduction

* # 1 Agreed and fixed in the results and discussion.
* # 2 Agreed and fixed in the methods section.
* # 3 Added and fixed.

Methods

* # 1 The sample was based on patients resident in Al-Ain city which include Omani’s entitled for health care services in Al-Ain. To our best of knowledge, it is unlikely that UAE resident patients seek treatment in Oman.

* # 2 Two thirds of the sample patients were recruited from primary health care centers and only one third were hospital based patients. Further details of sampling are added to the text.

* # 3 Details of sampling are added to the text.

* # 4 Interviews and reviews of patient's charts and physical examination were the procedures used for data collection. All were carried out by treating doctors.

* # 5 HBA1c was assessed in addition to the feedback by treating doctors regarding patient compliance.

* # 6 Details of assessment were verified and added to the text.

* # 7 Interobserver variations is thought to be minimal since the two ophthalmologists were basically using the same procedure for assessment and the same grading system for DR which, has been discussed and agreed about before commencing the study.
In response to reviewer R Tapp

Major compulsory revisions:

Study Aims:
1. Agreed

Background:
2. New literature has been added and the manuscript is improved
3. Agreed and fixed.
4. Agreed and fixed.
5. Fixed

Methods:
6. Agreed
7. Details about ophthalmologists who took part in the study were provided. We maintain that the research
team included the two ophthalmologists discussed and agreed upon the grading system of retinopathy prior conducting the survey.

8. The reference for the grading system we used for DR has been added to the text. Although the slit lamp examination was among the procedures in use along with fundoscopy and therefore, was mentioned in the study methods, we confirmed that all cases included in the study underwent digital fundus photography.

9. Measurement details of the BMI, hypertension, lipids profile have been added to the text with reference.

10. The study subjects were known diagnosed diabetics.

Results:
11. Agreed and fixed.
12. Agreed and fixed.
13. Agreed and fixed.

Discussion:
15. Agreed and fixed.

Abstract:
16. Agreed
17. Agreed and fixed.
18. Agreed and fixed.

Minor revisions
19. Agreed and fixed.