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**Reviewer's report:**

Minor Essential Revisions:

- The authors have answered most of the reviewers’ points. However, I still believe that since the paper is mainly studying the impact of interested providers on the quality of diabetes care, it would be informative if the authors described the characteristics of their providers such as their age, gender, specialization and years of practice, and to compare their results with others. If these characteristics are not available, I suggest to include these factors in the discussion and to mention them as limitations of the study. An article related to this topic is attached.

- It would also be interesting to analyze the achievements of the outcomes by age of the patients.

Discretionary Revisions:

**Results:**

- In the results’ section, the presentation of the results should be confined only to the present study data. Comparison of their data with others should be mentioned in the Discussion section.

- The age of the patients in the present study is younger than, rather than comparable to that of Scotland. Age is one of the factors that affected the outcomes. This is one of the points that the authors may include in the Discussion, which may over-estimated their results. For this reason, it would also be interesting to analyze the achievements of the outcomes by age.

Minor issues not for publication

Abstract; results paragraph: 'Ireland' to be replaced by 'this initiative'.

Methods:

In Sample' Practices paragraph:

- '3' to be replaced by 'three'; 'Chose' by 'chosen'; and '10' by 'ten'.

- 'The sample represents a small proportion of the total number of GPs in Ireland (approx... 1%), reflecting the special interest nature of diabetes management in primary care' to be replaced by 'The sample represents nearly 1% of the total number of GPs in Ireland'.
In patients' paragraph:
- Definition of adult patients: The authors probably means > rather than < 18 years

Strengths and limitations
- 'Standarised' should be corrected to 'standardised'.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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