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Reviewer’s report:

This paper reports a single centre RCT of a management programme for people with type 2 diabetes in Saudi Arabia. It is reported to CONSORT standards. The results showed that the programme was successful in improving diabetes control with the associated variables suggesting that the mechanism was increased clinic visits leading to escalation of insulin therapy. The weight gain amongst the intervention group is consistent with this mechanism.

The study is not particularly novel and the finding that intensive treatment leads to improved control is consistent with the literature. What is novel is the setting and the very poor level of diabetes control of the participants. The authors point out the particular problems with diabetes in Saudi Arabia and it may be worth including the name of the country in the title.

The main weakness of the study is the difference between the intervention and control groups. This is mentioned but the choice to present unadjusted statistics should also be justified.

The other weakness of this study is the lack of a health economic evaluation of the intervention, and this should also be addressed in the discussion.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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