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Re-Review
Cancer incidence in patients with type 2 diabetic mellitus: a population-based cohort study in Shanghai. Xu et al.
Pierre-Antoine Dugué, 10 August 2015

Some minor changes have been made to the manuscript. Here are the points to be reconsidered – I have kept the same numbers as in the previous review.

Major compulsory revisions
1. The sentence l144-146 is unclear.
2. Other studies are briefly mentioned, but their findings hardly compared to those of the present study.
4. Authors have copied word for word my comment. Because it has been placed after a paragraph on genetic factors (paragraph very difficult to follow, and not answering the comment), the resulting paragraph is unsound. How are the authors planning to act on genetic factors?? Unacceptable answer.
5. The prostate cancer SIR went from 5.4 to 2.9 (still highly significant), although not marked in red. In a meta-analysis (Long XJ, Asian Pac J Cancer Prev, 2012), it was found that diabetes was associated with an increased risk of prostate cancer in Asians but the RR was strongly reduced after adjustment for confounders (unadjusted RR= 2.82, adjusted RR= 1.31). This should be commented on, and the genetic factors properly discussed. Furthermore, L221-225 are unclear and tend to disprove the point the authors want to make – the Nat Genet study for example included some Chinese data with the same findings regarding genetic variants associated with and increased risk of prostate cancer and decreased risk of diabetes.
6. Conclusion should be nuanced all over the manuscript.
7. Have the results completely changed following reclassification of 2 oropharyngeal cancer cases or for other reasons?
8. The English writing must be considerably improved, for example by being read and corrected by a native English speaker. Extensive editing of the manuscript is also required.

Minor essential revisions
1. The aim of the manuscript was to assess the link between TD2M and prostate cancer, not the link between other factors and prostate cancer. Please rephrase the sentence l246-249.

2. Please rephrase l242-243. I don’t well see the link between follow-up time and causality.

5. Other parameters could have been investigated, such as the length of follow-up? Are there any other variables available to the authors that could have been investigated? Did authors have any information on diabetes onset date?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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