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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The authors report incidence rates of diabetes in an Aboriginal prospective cohort with 11 year follow up. Their research question/hypothesis is not explicitly stated in their methods.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods appear appropriate and are reasonable well described.

3. Are the data sound?
The data appear sound although the authors relied on hospital records for follow up and admittedly there is a risk that they failed to capture a diabetes diagnosis/diabetic incident for individuals included in the analysis. The authors do not comment on the quality of the data made available to them in the medical records at the center studied. This is a remote community, what is the likelihood that individuals have moved to live in other communities and were not captured? The authors should comment on this further.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
To some extent, however, the authors should comment further on the generalizability of this study to Aboriginal people as a whole in Australia. This cohort was established in 1992 in a remote community. What do the authors believe the generalizability is to all Aboriginal Australians?

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Not really.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title is appropriate. The abstract conveys their overall message.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.

Summary:
This is an epidemiologic study that sheds further light on the incidence of type 2 diabetes over a period of an Aboriginal person’s lifetime. Its main weakness is that the data is outdated despite a median 11 year follow-up and that the individuals followed are from a remote community.

Discretionary revisions:
It is acceptable for publication. There are a few grammatical errors that require further proofreading.

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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