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Reviewer’s report:

The authors reviewed the manuscript accurately for almost all critical points. All major revisions were accurately taken into account. Nonetheless some minor issues should be further addressed:

1. Major revision number 2: the authors should change the notation "T2DM" to "previously diagnosed T2DM" also in Table 3.

2. Authors should revise the results paragraph since some of the coefficients are not accurately reported as they are stated in table3.

3. Minor essential revision number 2: the authors included a table with all variables and their brief definitions. By suggesting its inclusion I was mainly aiming at (a) Including a more detailed explication of those variables which were defined in this context by the authors, such as structural and functional characteristics of the social network and educational level (since it is not based on an international classification, known at a glance also to the international reader); (b) Making the text more fluent. By including Table 1 as suggested by the authors in this second version of this manuscript, these aims are only partly fulfilled, while also adding additional critical issues. My suggestions on this point are:

3.1 The definition of all General Measurements variables in Table 1 is superfluous, since the measurement unit and possible outcomes are listed in Table 2. The only variable for which the reader needs an explication (furnished by the authors in both versions of the manuscript) is educational level. I would suggest the authors to eliminate from the table all these variables and to include the definition of educational levels at the bottom of Table 2 or with a footnote in the text.

3.2 Table 1 (without the General Measurements) should be carefully and critically revised. Authors might also consider including it in the appendix as supplementary material, if they do not find it necessary in the text body. In the table, name of the variable, unit of measurement and definition should be consistently reported. Despite the presence of the table, all variables regarding functional support must still be named in the text, in a way which does not impair text fluency. The table should be named at the end of both par. 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 as an additional and thorough information background for the reader.
3.3 Par. 2.2.4: What the reader is missing at this point, is how the score 0-5 is computed. Authors should include a detailed account (in the text or, in case the computation is complex, in the appendix, close to the table) on how this score is computed. This is not a trivial point: the reader should be able to associate to a "one unit less" emotional support something more concrete.

3.4 Last but not least: authors included a definition of socially isolated individuals (Table 1, Network size). Authors should quantify what they assumed as a "smaller social network size" for the definition of socially isolated individuals.

4. Figure 2: authors should consider changing the scale from 0.10 to 0.05.

5. In Table 2, thank you for including italics titles. Authors should consider writing the different subpopulations in educational level, employment status, smoking status as separate rows, not as values separated by slash.

6. The authors should read critically and revise the language in the whole manuscript. Several spaces are included or missing: par. 2.2.4, 2.2.5, line 257). In addition, the authors should limit their use of parentheses to complement the text (e.g. par. 3.1: "Figure 1 shows (a simplified representation of) the social network size...".). Line 206: consider revising the whole phrase. Lines 317-321: consider dividing the phrases. Line 349: repetition. Line 363: "whom" should be substituted with "who".
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