Reviewer's report

Title: Into the Abyss: Diabetes process of care indicators and outcomes of defaulters from a Canadian tertiary Care Multidisciplinary Diabetes Clinic.

Version: 2 Date: 3 June 2013

Reviewer: Jim Banta

Reviewer's report:

The paper, "into the abyss: diabetes process of care indicators and outcomes of defaulters from a Canadian tertiary care multidisciplinary diabetes clinic" is adequately written.

The most substantial comment regards methods - first describe data sources, ie. FEDC, linkage to ICES, and OACIS, then define subjects, then discuss measures (is there any info on inter-rater reliability?)

Additional comments:

1. Sample size should be included in the abstract
2. in statistical analysis, what is meand by "normal theory methods"?
3. use "one-way analysis of variance" throughout methods
4. several times the phrase, "defaulters had a trend" is used, was this a statistically signficient trend?
5. why no pair-wise comparisons for table 3?
6. for discussion, what is the implication of the 2008 CDA guidelines vs. the 2003 guidelines?
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interests' below