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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have been extremely responsive to reviewers’ critiques and the manuscript is stronger. There are very few remaining issues to be addressed. The few are as follows:

1. P. 14: The level of detail on which counties in Appalachian Ohio and the percentages of people with diabetes is unnecessary. An overall snapshot would suffice.

2. Given the preeminence of the Diabetes Endocrine Center in which this navigation project took place, can the authors comment on whether and how such a program might be able to exist in a less well resourced environment? That is, what are the chances of dissemination of this approach to other, less well endowed centers or communities?

3. Page 34, lines 39-40, consider rephrasing: …the social determinant need". The authors have done a good job revising their use of this term, but in this line, they seem to go back to substituting "social determinant" for "risk factor."

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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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?
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