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Reviewer's report:

"Duration of diabetes prior to surgery" as added to the manuscript introduction needs to be referenced.

Prior to manuscript publication, some derivative of the Authors response the Reviewer's response regarding diabetes duration prior to surgery needs to be added to the Discussion and its potential impact on diabetes remission must be discussed.

Please add some sort of formatting to the tables beyond columnar organization in order to guide the reader to the most relevant observations. Perhaps significance levels can be denoted by asterisks (*<0.05, **0.05, ***<0.001, ****<0.0001) instead of reporting the actual p-value?

The Tables also consistently misspell "Comparisons." The entire manuscript needs to be spell checked.

The acronyms currently used to identify the 3 different populations of interest (NDM, DMHpNDM, DMHpDMH) require much effort by the reader to keep straight as they are so similar. Recommend using other acronyms (Group A,B,C, etc.). All acronyms and abbreviations in the Table should be listed in the individual Table legend.

Regarding Table 2 and Figure 1.

While the Akaike information criteria was apparently used to decide on the number of clusters, the number of members in each cluster (46, 69, 8, 8, 17) seems highly disparate and skewed. How do you justify the data and interpretation from such small (n=8,8) and disparately sized cohorts as being at all relevant/meaningful? Clarifying text should be added to the manuscript.
Additional sub-population stratification by sex is unwarranted and further reduces n in the DMHpDMH group to 4 (F) and 4(M) (and in the case of insulin values to 3 subjects). In the context of the 741 subjects enrolled in the study per the abstract, this cannot be biologically meaningful.

The "p value" row exists in all Table sections, but has no information in it, and should be removed.

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

**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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