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Reviewer’s report:

The article is well-written. However, the scientific contribution of the study is not clear from the introduction or conclusion. The singular association between diabetes status and the QOL measure does not provide any specific information that would inform assessment or treatment. Essential question to answer would be how does this information change or inform current practice? It could be made more significant by comparing QOL in T2DM who were identified early on (as pre-diabetics) vs. those who were diagnosed with frank T2DM to see if there was a different in HRQOL. It would be important to explain why this QOL measure was chosen and not combined with other assessment instruments or methods (i.e. exercise tolerance, monofilament testing, etc.). Lastly, by grouping those subjects with IFG and IGT into one group, you may be overlooking important differences between groups as evidenced by some of the results. I would rerun stats treating these groups separately, or excluded IGT from the analysis.

There is a typo on line 172, should read "score" not "sore".

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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