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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   compleste

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?
   it may be expanded with a managerial focus on

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Elegant and clear

Minor revisions
To test Idl size , Tg levels, Cycle lenght
To assess metabnolic syndrome prevalence
To focus on differences of care

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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