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Reviewer's report:

General
Thank you for letting me review this manuscript. The manuscript describes a retrospective study with the aim of measuring the rate of glucose measurements in a practice, and assesses the rate of follow-up for abnormal results. It is interesting seen from a family physician viewpoint and is essential in the discussion continuously going on about screening for type 2 diabetes. The second purpose is however the absolute most interesting topic. The authors find that only a small part of abnormal (diabetic) values actually were taken action on. This is very new for me, and I think that this result should be more focused at in the title, and as well in the discussion. For example a discussion about reasons for lacking follow up will be very interesting.

In general I recommend the editor to reject the paper, with possibility to resubmit.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The methods described are sufficient, and more or less the only way of getting the answers questioned. But they are time consuming and I constantly find a part of the study not of current interest. However one major task for the authors will be to give a more detailed description of the target population, and the flow of persons selected and excluded. It is by now very hard to understand from which population the 621 reviewed medical records come from. What does "initial visits" mean? It is used twice in the patient characteristics paragraph, in a way that makes the selection procedure not transferable. The possibility of selection bias has as well to be discussed.

About the results I have one majo complain, which is that it could be useful to know the distribution of number of glucose tests per patient. Normally this kind of distributions are not normally, but skewed against zero. It can be questioned if the chosen logistic regression method is the most appropriate in a situation with a non-normally distribution.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Concerning the title I find that it could be catchier, by focusing at the insufficient follow up of abnormal glucose values. If the authors chose to change the main object of the manuscript the abstract has to follow this.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.