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Reviewer's report:

The study is professionally performed, and the presentation is sufficiently narrow. Furthermore, there is a substantial innovative contribution that calls for publication.

I have only one major request, and that is related to the choice of Poisson regression.

It is commonly accepted that the Poisson regression is subject to a dispersion problem, given that the variance is restricted to be equal to the mean, and it is common practice to use Negative Binomial (Negbin) regression instead.

I recommend the authors to follow this practice. Indeed, it is easy to implement the Negbin in SAS - just Google the words "negbin in SAS", and you will be taken directly to the few statements used.

Furthermore, I would like to call the authors' attention to two recent (2017) studies by Sortsø et al., where socioeconomic inequality in morbidity and healthcare utilisation among Danish diabetes patients are analysed along the lines of van Doorslaer et al. It would be natural to include these among the references.

I wish you good luck with the revision, and I look forward to see the final result.
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