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Reviewer's report:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISION

The MS “C-reactive protein genetic variant is associated with diabetic retinopathy in Chinese type 2 diabetic patients” is rather well written research paper. In their study on a large sample of cases and controls they demonstrated that CRP rs2808629 was associated with DR in the Chinese type diabetic patients.

Abstract is informative, well written.

Introduction section should be improved.

Comment 1: At the end of the first paragraph of the Introduction section (page 3, after lines 51, 52) the authors should mention the importance of genetic factors before starting with CRP. Nice nice review of candidate genes for DR is below (ref 1)


Comment 2: In the aim of the study (page 4, line 63) the authors should omit the phrase “after adjustment for established conventional risk factors”. It is not necessary.

Methods section is generally OK, although few details should be improved.

Comment 3: In the first paragraph of the Methods section (page 4, line 3) the newer criteria of the T2DM should be used (se below) instead of WHO from 1999 American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. Diabetes Care. 2012; 35(Suppl. 1):S64-S71.

Comment 4: In the first paragraph of the Methods section, Participants (page 4, line 3) the authors wrote that the patients were unrelated. How was this evaluated? Genetically or just according to personal history?

Comment 5: In the Methods section the authors should write whether they used Bonferroni correction for multiple testing. If not, than it would be appropriate to use it.
Discussion section should be improved.

Comment 6: In the first paragraph of the Discussion section the authors should start with the answer to the aims of the study, and not to start will secondary introduction.

Comment 7: In the whole manuscript the authors should omit the expression “diabetic”: in diabetic population, diabetic patients

The should be for example: in subjects with diabetes mellitus or subjects with T2DM or something similar

Comment 8: In the last paragraph of the Discussion section (Conclusions) the authors should improve the sentence: Further studies are needed to replicate this finding in other populations.

Comment 9: Language should be improved (native speaker or expert for English language).

The paper may be accepted after major revision.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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