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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript takes a look at the comparison of claims data and self-reported data for identifying diabetics. The paper is well written and describes the methods well. There are some minor revisions that I have for the authors.

1. Methods, page 7. The denominators need to be better described here. 83% of ... who consented to the blood sample - is that 83 % of those who consented to blood sample or 83% of those with biomarkers consented to linkage? Also 2nd paragraph, 88% consented or 88% were linked for those who consented? Perhaps adding N totals here would aid in understanding. (MINOR ESSENTIAL)

2. Discussion section, page 13, 1st paragraph "we find strengths and weaknesses...". The authors should re-summarize these strengths and weaknesses for readers. The discussion is lacking detail as to when to use the claims or self-report. (MINOR ESSENTIAL)

3. Table 2 is confusing when (%) is in label but the cells have % first and then N in (). Either change label to %(N) or cells to N (%) (MINOR ESSENTIAL)

4. Unclear of what the 'younger-old' term means on page 7 2nd paragraph (DISCRETIONARY)

5. Page 7, 2nd paragraph, last sentence "Diabetes prevalence is higher..." should perhaps be moved to the limitations section when explaining why sample bias (DISCRETIONARY)

6. page 9, 2nd paragraph CIs and p-values are presented and then proportions without CI are presented. Try to keep it consistent - add p-value or CI to 25.6 of the survey data. (DISCRETIONARY)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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