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Reviewer's report:

This paper by Le Fur et al is an interesting analysis addressing a significant bias of epidemiological studies. A pediatric population with Type 1 diabetes is the target population of this analysis. Overall, the objective of this analysis is clearly described, the statistical analysis appears to be appropriate and the results are well-presented and well-discussed. However, I have some comments to make regarding this manuscript:

Major compulsory revisions:

1] I understand that the data presented in this paper are derived from the database of the ongoing ISIS-DIAB study, which investigates the association of genetic and environmental factors with type 1 diabetes in a pediatric population. I consider that a short description of the objective and methods of this epidemiological study should be included in the Background of this manuscript. In this context, please kindly answer whether this analysis is one of the pre-defined endpoints of the ISIS-DIAB study. Please also include this study’s registration number and a relevant citation. Moreover, please kindly confirm if this study includes a control cohort. If this is the case this should be described in this manuscript by answering whether questionnaires were distributed to the control group. This could help compare the response rates of the type 1 diabetes group with those of the control group as well as assess the between-group differences in parameters predicting the response rates.

Minor essential revisions:

1] Page 5, line 120: ‘send’ = ‘sent’

2] Please define all abbreviations as well as study acronyms wherever first appear in the text and use consistently thereafter.

3] In Tables please express non-Gaussian distributed variables as median(range)

4] In the Results section please avoid presenting data already presented in Tables.

5] Page 10, line 237: ‘were analyzed’ = ‘was analyzed’

6] Please explain all abbreviations used at the end of each table

7] Figure 3. Survival = ?
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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