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Reviewer's report:

Major concerns

*The meaning of an abbreviation should be specified from the first time it is used. In different sections of the manuscript, there are abbreviations not clarified (e.g. in Abstract section, line 46: AHR).

*The key words "vascular complication" and "University of Gondar" are not MeSH terms.

*The manuscript has misspellings that are repeated systematically (e.g. "dieses", "Stork", "patents", "co morbidity").

*The authors must clarify what does "Institution based" study means. I think authors refer to a single-center study.

*Material section lacks of the diagnostic criteria used to define each vascular complication assessed (this must be specified despite the study only recorded it from clinical chart).

*The authors must clarify what does positive or negative "protein urea" refers to.

*The manuscript present data with IQR, however, they present a single number. Does it belongs to 25 or 75 percentile?

*Table 1 and table 2 lack of units of the variables. In addition, a table legend should be added to clarify abbreviations used.

*In the "Result" section, information of "Predictors of vascular complication among type II DM patients" should be summarized since information is repeated in table 2.

*In table 3, authors must specify by which variables the HR was adjusted.
*The discussion section compares data obtained with those of other countries like India and Taiwan. However due to the study didn't describe diagnostic criteria used, this data can't be compared.

*The authors observed that sex seems to be related with vascular complications. Did they perform a statistical analysis stratified by sex? (This could be important for sex-modified variables as c-HDL). Additionally the authors explain that "factors like PCOS, preeclampsia, gestational DM or physical activities" could be associated to the differences in vascular complication incidence between male and female. However none of these variables was assessed.

*Explanations about the importance of lipids in the development of vascular complications are too basic. Details about the pathophysiological mechanism involved should be included.

*The English language needs to be reviewed.

*The background section doesn't highlight the importance of the study.

Minor concerns

*Authors in title page have two institutional addresses; nevertheless all seem to be affiliated to first one. I suggest to correct institutional addresses.

*I suggest summarizing "methods" and "result" section in Abstract. Both sections contain the number of patients.

*There are misspelled words in conclusion section in the abstract: "was remaining" (line 53), "comorbidity" (line 56), "deslipidemia" (line 56).

*The paragraph 3 of page 4 (Background section) seems to be incomplete.

In general, it is an interesting text about the factors associated with the development of diabetic vascular complications in the studied population. However, the manuscript lacks of the criteria used for evaluating each of those complications or the techniques used for the biochemical analysis. For this reason, the study could not be compared with others reported in the literature. The discussion section should explain the importance of the reported findings and not only compare the incidence found with those of other countries.
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.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
No

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:
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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