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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have revised their manuscript considerably in light of reviewers comments. The methods are much clearer and this shows a scientific approach that did not come across clearly in the first manuscript. In particular patient selection and exclusion criteria and protocols for glycaemic control were appropriate. The statistical analysis has been tightened up and now looks appropriate. The analysis is now much more informative and results are presented clearly. Adjusting changes for treatment duration by calculating changes/year appears much more comparable and transparent, aiding the readers understanding. The authors have also revised the discussion and I particularly like the conclusions with the approach of the CF centre clearly stated. I think the manuscript in its current form makes a useful contribution to the field of CF diabetes and would be read with interest by clinicians in this speciality.

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

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

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

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

1. The authors write that hospital and institutional review boards approved of the study protocol. This follows a paragraph on how treatments were selected for patients. I found this confusing as I thought the study was a retrospective review of patients treated in this clinic and therefore did not understand how these boards could have reviewed and approved the treatment protocols prospectively.

2. Despite many improvements there are still a number of typographical and sentence errors which would benefit from editorial input. For example exclusion criteria were described twice in similar/same fashion in 2 different paragraphs in the methods, the abstract methods contains sentences that need proof reading, as does the final sentence of the abstract conclusion, the first paragraph of the background still needs polishing, in the methods patients elected treatment after informedâ€¦. (presumably consent) etcâ€¦.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

My residual comments are:

1. The treatment periods for the oral hypoglycaemics were strikingly short.

2. The insulin group seem to have received insulin because they had very high HbA1c? However HbA1c did not change at all per year in patients on insulin. Accepting that HbA1c is not a perfect marker for glycaemic control in CF this still suggests that insulin had no effect.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
**Statistical review:** No
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