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Reviewer's report:

General Comment: Generally a well-written paper with useful information.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Pg3, second paragraph: NHANES is National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Since NHANES was a cross-sectional study the fact that mean age remained constant doesn’t necessarily imply that aging was counterbalanced by younger age of diagnosis. It could mean that the age at diagnosis is not changing and the mean age of death is not changing.
2. Pg5, line 14: one usually measures CVs of quality controls, not standards (or calibrators).
3. The authors should use either “loss to follow-up” or preferably “lost to follow-up” throughout but not both.
4. Pg10, line 7: It might be clearer to say “10-year decline in HbA1c” (so that decline doesn’t imply decline in glycemic control).
5. Figure 1: The graph needs axis labels (HbA1c for x-axis and mean change in HbA1c (1996 to 2006) for y-axis). Also, the value label for the 9-10% bar is partly missing and <=11.0% should be >=11.0%.
6. Figure 2 and legend: loss or lost to follow-up?
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