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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Saisho

Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in the BMC Endocrine Disorders. We believe the revised manuscript is improved and look forward to your editorial decision. We have addressed the reviewer’s comments on our manuscript below.

Sincerely,

April 6, 2019

Tomohiko Ukai, MD, MSc
Department of Community Medicine, TSU,
Mie University School of Medicine
Response to reviewers:

Reviewer 1:

Thank you
You have adequately addressed the points I raised. I have some additional minor points.
—Thank you very much.

In the text at end of results please put …regarding mean annual medical costs....
—We put this passage at the end of results.

You may want to comment on exercise which seems to increase in the next year results for the bimonthly follow up group. See table 3.
—We placed the comment on exercise (Result section, line 1, page 13).

In the discussion you say Both studies indicate that a shorter follow up interval is not associated with maintain good control in patients who have already achieved the treatment goal. I find it hard to know what you mean. The sentence can be simplified.
Can you say if you agree - In both studies for patients already at the treatment goal shorter follow up made no difference in maintaining good control
—Thank you for your comment. I simplified the sentence as your advice (Discussion section, line 3, page 14)

Physician density - better to say this differently - eg physician availability in the area
—We changed the “physician density” to physician availability in the area.

Figure 1 For each box it should be the number of individuals eg 8518 rather than the number of samples 12145 and so on down the diagram. n= 7682 is the number of patients, similarly 1686
and this is what the reader will want to see. Alternatively if you prefer you can show both number of patients and corresponding number of samples for each box.

—We changed the Figure 1 according to your advice (Figure 1).

Reviewer 2:

On page 12 line 12-13, 'were not within the same of equivalence but there was not a significant difference between the groups'. Do the authors mean that there was no statistically significant difference?

—Yes. From our analysis, they were not equivalent. Also there were not statistically significant difference.

On page 13, line 4, will suggest putting the mean/median cost with SD/range.

—I appreciate your comment. We put standard deviation (Result section, line 4, page 13)