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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes a retrospective review of inpatient data in 512 Thai patients, the study compares diabetes status by OGTT and HbA1c. Although this type of study has been completed in many different populations, this is reported to be the first time this question has been assessed in a Thai population.

I have a few concerns which I think need to be addressed.

* The methods state "we reviewed a population sample…." I think the word population should be removed. This is a very bias sample of high risk patients attending hospital - so it's not a population based study. This is the major limitation of the study and this should be added to the discussion.
* The Thai diabetes risk score is not mentioned in the methods.
* Correlation should never been used to assess agreement - this is fundamentally wrong. See https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2868172 Figure 5 should be replaced with a Bland Altman plot and this analysis needs changing.
* On page 11 you state "The correlations of the two tests……" ROC plots do not assess correlation. Please amend.
* I'm not sure what the p value for the kappa tells us, both are highly significant but one kappa is deemed to show fair agreement and the other none. Also 95% CI should be added to the kappa values.
* Add 95% confidence intervals to all sensitivities and specificities.
* Figures 4 a and b are the wrong way around.

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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