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Reviewer's report:

The authors carried out clinical study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of sitagliptin in a practical clinical setting and they found that sitagliptin is effective in monotherapy or combination therapy.

Their findings seem to be useful for clinical practitioners.

However, this manuscript includes some minor points to be corrected.

The inclusion criteria of patients about glucose control are not clear.

What does 'poorly controlled blood glucose' (written in line 12 of page 5) mean?

Is 'poorly controlled' used as the same meaning as inadequate blood glucose?

Judging from figure 5, patients whose blood glucose was not inadequate were included in this study.

The adverse events are reported to have occurred in 55 cases. The data whether the patients discontinued sitagliptin due to the adverse events or not are not described. Such information is supposed to be important to evaluate the safety profile of the drug.

Their finding that sitagliptin showed weaker glucose-lowering effects in medium-dose glimepiride considering the baseline HbA1c of this group is interesting.

How about a possibility that this weak effects are derived from inadequate life style regulation of this group?

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

No

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.

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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