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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. The question posed by the authors is well defined; it is the durability of the effects from 52 weeks to 104 week with open labeled once weekly exenatide treatment. The article provides important information, but the presentation does not make it easy to interpret that data.

2. The methods are clear, but the way the data is presented makes interpretation very tricky.

   The authors focus only on the completer population which in itself overestimates the effects from the ITT population. Fortunately the authors mistakenly left in a few references to the results for the ITT population which is what they should be reporting (along with the completers’ results for a more clear understanding of the data). It is especially important to include the ITT results when describing the changes from baseline to week 104. The completers’ analysis provides information also but it should be interpreted in the context of the ITT results.

3. Plus they continually focus on the effect from baseline to week 104, when the true focus of this article should be on the change from week 52 to 104. Alternatively they could report BL, week 30, week 52 and week 104 to provide a true overall picture of what happens with 2 years of treatment with exenatide QW. (This would be very valuable for Figure 1, in which one wonders what were the numbers and reasons for discontinuation at 1 year.). Plus the presentation in Figure 3a is the method in which all the data in 3c and 3d should be presented too.

**Minor essential revision:**

In the limitations section, they should discuss the limitations of completers’ analyses.

**Discretionary revision:**

Additionally, the doses of the drug should be mentioned in the abstract.

**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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