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Reviewer's report:

General This manuscript provides important new information to the field of CFRD. The manuscript needs re-working for readability.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Introduction - I recommend that the authors soften the criticism of the existing CF Foundation treatment policy and reduce such criticism to one or two sentences. The audience who needs to read this manuscript will be turned off by the strong message of negativity and will discount the results. I would recommend that authors state that current recommendation for insulin is not always feasible for patients due to reasons such as poor compliance and hypoglycemia. Additionally, other agents may be superior secondary to their anti-inflammatory properties.

2. Methods - a) make a clean separation of methods and results. Too often, the results are interlaced with methods. b) Subjects- Please let the reader know if 20 is the total number of diabetics in your population during this time period. If it is 23, then state total eligible for study was 23, but 3 were not included secondary to reasons you have given. This should be a crisp statement. c) Please include change in body weight as an end-point and note how weight was measured. How was compliance with therapy measured?

3. Results- a) many of the result statements are muddied by methodology. For example, mention weight as an endpoint in the introduction. Tell in methods how weight was measured. In results, simply put the data...weight gain for each therapy. Was the gain statistically significant? b) Please better explain motives for patients who switched off insulin. This is important as likely represents motives of others and reason why insulin may not always be the best therapy.

4. Discussion - do not end with statements that your paper does not prove. For example, you have a small subject number for metformin, yet say it is good. I would recommend softening the statement to say "our results suggest that metformin may be a good treatment option for patients with the following characteristics: no liver failure, Hba1c.... etc REwork the wording so the entire manuscript is easily read and crisp

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No
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