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Reviewer's report:

Influence of smoking and diet on glycated haemoglobin and pre diabetes categorisation : a cross sectional analysis

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes – the research question is appropriately detailed and provides key information for the reader

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes – these are detailed

3. Are the data sound?
Yes

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 – have you thought about/acknowledged newer potentially more accurate measures of glucose control? Glucose breath sampling with a radioactive tracer?

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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 – although not sure how relevant a study comparing 14 smoker and 10 non smokers is on page 12 when you have already made the point about the EPIC study which had a much larger sample size – would comparing 14 and 10 ever be statistically robust enough to detect significance?

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

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Writing is of a good standard – see some minor changes below that could be incorporated

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

Line 78 – and in a separate study (comprising of x subjects)- this sentence does not read particularly well so could be revised
Line 93- consider revising the word ‘unimportant’ here
Line 281 – blood glucose concentration – preferred term rather than levels?
Line 317 – our data does?
Line 338 – and inversely correlated with vegetable intake? Perhaps this makes the sentence more complete

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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