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Reviewer's report:

Specific comments to the authors

1. In the article, the following sentence had been repeated twice "A recent meta-analysis of 18 prospective studies found that the overall relative risk (RR) of T2D was 1.26 (95% confidence interval [CI] 1.16-1.37) per 1 log mg/L increment in CRP levels". Kindly check.

2. Shouldn't the control subjects be free of hypertension and dyslipidemia also? How many of them were on antihypertensive and hypolipidemic drugs? The cases and controls had similar LDL cholesterol levels. What could be the reason behind this?

3. The number of subjects in each quartile differs between Table 2 and Table 3. Also, in quartile 1, the number of diabetes subjects reduced from 78 to 66 when stratified by sex. Kindly explain.

4. The BMI calculated from the self reported weight could be biased as the participants may report either their current weight or their earlier one which may be a year before also. So, the BMI calculated could be a bias one and also its association with risk of diabetes. In Table 2 &3, on what basis the authors classified BMI for Model 3.

5. The A1C of the incident T2DM cases seems to be very low (6.8%). What is the range of A1C? Any reason to select cases with low A1C levels?

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

Yes

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

Yes

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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