MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

Methods/Analysis: The authors must provide details on how multivariate analyses were performed, in the Methods/Analysis sub-section rather than in the Results section.

It seems that the authors entered only the variables that were significantly associated with diabetic retinopathy in the bivariate analysis into multivariate logistic regression model. By doing that, they may have failed to control potential confounders that were not significantly associated with diabetic retinopathy (p-value > 0.05) but may have an effect on the occurrence of diabetic nephropathy (though non-significant). I suggest the authors to extend the threshold for inclusion into multivariate logistic regression model to a pre-defined p-value greater than 0.05 (such as 0.10, 0.15, 0.20). The authors should also use the epidemiological relevance of the variables as criteria for variable selection in the model.

The authors should present results of both univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

1- Methods: the authors state that “Use of diabetes medication was assessed by asking whether the patient took pills for diabetes in the past week and use of blood pressure medication was assessed by asking whether the patient took pills to control high blood pressure in the past week.”

So, if a diabetic treated patient has stopped taking his anti-diabetic treatment two weeks ago, for example because of financial limitations, does it mean that this patient does not use diabetic medication?

2- Methods: the authors should not present BMI as continuous variable, but rather categorize it according to range as normal weight (BMI: 18.5-24.9), overweight (BMI: 25.0-29.9), mild or class I obesity (BMI: 30.0-34.9), moderate or class II obesity (BMI: 35.0-39.9) and severe or class III obesity (BMI: # 40). Presenting BMI by the mean with standard deviation of the general sample is not informative enough.

3- Results: please provide standard deviation for mean.
4- Results: please define in the Methods section what is considered as “diabetic angiopathy” in the Results section.

5- Results: How do the authors explained that up to 62.9% of the patients did not know about the type of diabetes they had.

6- Results: the authors present data on obesity, thus they should provide the classification of obesity used (see comment 2).

7- Results: The authors state that “High cholesterol level was reported by 22.0%”. How was lipid profile assessed?

8- Results: the authors state that “Most of the patients (58.4%) described their overall health status as “satisfactory”, 26.4% described it as “bad”, 14.3% as “good”, 0.6% as “excellent”, and 0.3% as “very good”.” How was health status evaluated?

9- Table 1: BMI should be categorized (see comment 2).

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

1- Analysis: Please provide information on the manufacturer, town and country of the statistical software (SPSS version 17).

2- Results: “Ninety percent of the patients with DR had non-proliferative DR…” Correct to “ninety point two percent”
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