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Editor-in-Chief
BMC-Public Health

Re: Revised submission: *Disparities in Diabetes Care: Role of the Patient's Socio-Demographic Characteristics*

Dear Editor,

We thank you and the reviewers of our manuscript for their comments and suggestions. We have revised our manuscript accordingly and are pleased to resubmit it. We also took the comments in your e-mail into consideration and added all the necessary information.

In the attached we list our responses by reviewer and comment, marked in grey and turquoise for Reviewer no. 1 and no. 2, respectively, in the body of the manuscript. In addition, we have added notes to refer each correction.

We would like to note that Malka Avitzur, who carried out the original statistical analysis, asked to be removed from the list of authors. We have included the name of Ronit Peled PhD, who performed the revised statistical analysis, in the authors list.

The revised manuscript has been edited by a professional scientific (English) editir.

We thank you again for your help in improving our manuscript and for your interest in our article. We hope that the revised manuscript meets your demands and will be reconsidered for publication.

Sincerely,
Rachel Wilf-Miron, MD, MPH
Reviewer No. 1, Linda Penn:

Abstract:
Comment no. 1: done
Comment no. 2: done, the term "immigration" is explained
Comment no. 3: done, the entire statistical approach was revised; a new analysis has been performed, with the results presented.
Comment no. 4: done

Introduction:
Comment no. 1: done
Comment no. 2: done

Research design and methods:
Comment no. 1: done
Comment no. 2: done, the definition of immigration is now explained.
Comment no. 3: done

From analysis to action plan:
Comment no. 1: done. An explanation is provided.
Comment no. 2: the entire section about the action plan has been reduced for the sake of clarity according to Reviewer No. 2's suggestions,
Comment no. 3: done. We have clarified and explained our decision to include patients who had visited their GPs at least once during the previous year.
Comment no. 4: done

Conclusion:
Comment no. 1: done
Comment no. 2: done
Comment no. 3: done

Tables: All the tables are new and represent the new statistical approach. Tables 1 and 2 describe the variance in performance measures and intermediate outcomes between the study groups. Tables 3-5 describe the results of the final logistic regression models that were estimated for three different dependent variables. This new approach addresses the comments made by Reviewer No. 1.

Minor but essential revisions:
Comment no. 1: done
Comment no. 2: done
Comment no. 3: done
Reviewer No.2, Amal N. Trivedi

Major comments:
Comment no.1:  done
Comment no.2: We thank the reviewer for this comment. We have reconsidered our dependent variables and decided not to use HbA1C <7gr%. The revised analysis was conducted only for HbA1C >9gr%.
Comment no. 3 and 4: We reanalyzed our data according to the reviewer's suggestions.
Comment no.5: done

Other comments:
Comment no.1: done
Comment no.2: done. Since the relevant database is updated on a monthly basis, all performance measures are also calculated, according to the measure definition, every month. The process and intermediate outcome measures included in our study are all defined for a the last 12 months – therefore, measures calculated in Nov 2008 relate to the period 12/2007-11/2008.
Comment no.3: done. Additional explanations have been added
Comment no.4: We have no information regarding this question so no response was made in the manuscript.
Comment no. 5: done.