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Dear Editor:

We thank you and the three kind reviewers for the opportunity to revise our manuscript again for publication consideration in the BMC Public Health. We have revised our manuscript in light of the reviewers’ comments and made all the required changes to the format of the paper. We addressed the comments as follows:

**REVIEWER 1 (GURPRATAAP SANDHU)**

**Reviewer’s report:**

**MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISION:**
The language for conclusion in the abstract and in the main text needs to be similar. The null finding that the “interventions did not fare significantly better than usual care in achieving glycemic control” (as included in the main text) should also be included in the abstract conclusion.

**Response**

*We have made the language for conclusion in the abstract and in the main text similar by including the null finding that the “interventions did not fare significantly better than usual care in achieving glycemic control” in the abstract conclusion.*

**REVIEWER 2 (ANDRE PASCAL A KENGNE)**

**Reviewer’s report:**
None

**REVIEWER 3 (LINCOLN A SARGEANT)**

**Reviewer’s report:**
The study was well conducted and the authors have explained their responses to reviewers’ comments. The overall tone of the article and presentation of results in the tables and figures may restrict the accessibility of the findings to those with closely related interests and statistical backgrounds. Many clinicians and public health practitioners will find it difficult to appraise the detailed results of the trial.

**Response**

*We share your sentiments about the use of advanced statistics in our study. However, this was the best way to analyze the data as complex as we gathered in this well-conducted study. We hope that clinicians and public health practitioners with limited statistical backgrounds will at least find the conclusion, which is in plain, simple language, very useful.*