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Reviewer’s report:

Major Revisions:
1. The most interesting aspect of this study is the service use of these clients. The authors identified 707 records of the 830 estimated diabetics in this region. I would suggest this be moved to the results section, with an explanation about how diabetic services are delivered in this health sector. Eg the transition process, is there someone to remind them of appointments or contact them if they fail to attend, when and where are the clinics, is there access to 24hr hotline for advice, do they pay to attend, do they have to wait long, is complications assessments performed at the clinic or do they have to go elsewhere. Do you have any data to estimate GP use (eg from medicare), is there are private endocrinologists or diabetes education services they may use?? How does the health services offered to young diabetic patients in the area compare to the national guidelines.

2. The number of complications assessments documented and abnormalities detected in these assessments would be easier to interpret if presented in a table. How many eye assessments or AER were documented? There are two sentences describing AER above threshold on page 11- is one for macroalbuminuria and one for microalbuminuria?

Discretionary revisions.
1. Another interesting aspect of the study is the number of unplanned hospital attendance’s. This could be highlighted.

2. Low rates of HbA1c measurements being reported were mentioned. Were there any attempt to also examine the HbA1c values from HAPs at HNEH or the main private laboratories.

3. The described associated between vascular risk factors and complications are not novel. And there have been larger cohort studies that provided stronger evidence for causality. This section could be omitted so the manuscript could focus more on health service delivery.

7. On page 14 the authors state that the prevalence of retinopathy in their study was less than that described in 2000. Although this may be true, the low level of screening documented in this study potentially underestimates the true level of retinopathy in this population.
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