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Professor Lotufo

Associate Editor, \textit{BMC Public Health}

Dear Professor Lotufo

Thank you very much for your email regarding our manuscript, Randomised controlled trial of an automated, interactive telephone intervention (TLC Diabetes) to improve type 2 diabetes management: Baseline findings and six-month outcomes’. We appreciate your comments and have amended our manuscript accordingly.

1. Competing interests
We have changed our ‘Conflict of interests’ section to ‘Competing interests’, and included our relevant declaration (pages 15-16).

2. We understand that the study design involved the collection of follow-up data after 12 months, could you clarify whether the results from this further follow-up have already been collected and analyzed?

The 12 month data for this study have been collected but not analysed yet. The main aim of this current manuscript is to establish the effectiveness of this novel intervention at six month follow-up, as well as to provide a detailed examination of the baseline characteristics of the sample. A future manuscript will examine whether the short term outcomes of such a novel intervention are sustainable in the longer term and how these might be enhanced with the development of other smartphone and web supports.

Associate Editors comments:
1. The abstract section is too small with few methods and results...... Please, add information about mean age, sex ratio..., and the authors must explain which methods were used for quality of life.

We have now amended the abstract to provide more information about the sample and data collection methods (page 2).

2. Table 1 must be transferred to the methods section.

Table 1 has been moved to the methods section on page 5.

3. Table 2 must be more comprehensible with no abbreviations.

All abbreviations have been removed from Table 2 or explained in the footnote (pages 21-22).

4. Finally, loss to be follow-up must be analyzed more carefully.

The characteristics of the participants who withdrew from the study were carefully compared with those people who remained in the study using appropriate statistical tests (now described on page 8), and no differences were observed across any of the sociodemographic, behavioural or biological profiles. We have now provided some extra details about this on page 10.

5. I strongly recommend adding a new column to a new table 1 (baseline) with a comparison to the AusDiab.

We have added an extra column to table 2 (pages 21-22) that presents the characteristics of the AusDiab sample, and removed table 4. We have added a footnote to the table to explain that the inter-study comparisons compared the total TLC sample and the AusDiab subsample, and also to
explain that where data are missing for AusDiab subsample, it is the result of different data collection methods between the studies.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have further queries.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Emily Williams
School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine
Monash University, Alfred Hospital
89 Commercial Road, Melbourne, Australia 3004
Phone +61 3 9903 0255
emily.d.williams@monash.edu