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Reviewer's report:
1. Although an appreciable effort made in assessing a method aimed at reducing the need of multiple insulin injections throughout the day, a control group would have been needed in the study.

2. There is not a direct comparison between a control group and alternative treatment. A post hoc test would be appropriate in this case in order to assess a direct comparison between the control and the study group. Therefore, either examination of two parallel groups or examination of the same group before and after treatment would have been acceptable controls.

3. Although conclusions have been drawn correctly based on the outcomes of the study, parameters varied a lot throughout the study. Therefore an homogeneous group could not be detected in comparison to the beginning of the study, likewise adjustments made during the study should not be accepted if you want to compare the beneficial effects of a new treatment versus the standard.

4. Raw data are necessary and the exact number of screened people, withdrawals and primary and secondary outcomes need to be defined prior to the beginning of the study.

5. Legends under graphs and tables should include statistical analysis performed post hoc test and n numbers.

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.
No

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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