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Reviewer’s report:

Overall
This is a worthwhile paper. The analysis seems well done with appropriate figures.

Major compulsory revisions
There are sometimes changes of tense within sentences and paragraphs.
In the discussion in particular, the sentences are very long and convoluted. It would benefit from shorter, clearer sentences.

Discussion
2) Paragraph 5 discussing HbA1c is confusing. Look at dividing the third sentence into two, or shortening the second half of that sentence.
3) Paragraph 6 discussing hypoglycaemia. Given there are only two studies, more details about the studies, how they defined hypoglycaemia and the rate of mild vs severe hypoglycaemic episodes would be interesting and helpful
4) Paragraph 7 – sentence 3 is confusing, again a long sentence and it might benefit from being broken up into shorter sentences.
5) Paragraph 8 about the economic evaluation needs expansion. At the moment, you have one sentence which says that PCC is economic but that in population studies only 34% of women get PCC. The two things are not directly linked. Perhaps you need to say explicitly that PCC is economically beneficial. That population studies show only 34% of women get PCC and that therefore there is a potential for health service benefit that has not been addressed.

Minor essential revisions
1) Abstract:
In the results section, the sentence starting “meta-analysis……” is repeated.
Need an = sign in between NNT and 19 on line 6 of results section
2) Figures
Figure 4, figure 5, the text and picture are distorted and blurred.
Title in figure 5, do you mean “from” rather than “form”?
3) Results
It would be interesting to know if any comment can be made about severe
compared to mild hypoglycaemia.
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