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Reviewer's report:

The study compares the effectiveness of monthly vs bimonthly follow up of Japanese patients with well controlled type 2 diabetes and shows that outcomes are equivalent at one year. The study is clearly presented. There are a few points for clarification.

Background- second last paragraph - suggest change "but the difference was not clinically relevant" to "...not of clinical significance."

Methods -

Opt out recruitment. I understand the need for this. How was it actually done? Do patients routinely agree to use of their data?

Aging rate - can you please explain this briefly

Results

Table 3 - please include n= at top of columns of results.

Please check annual costs as text and table 3 are different

Table 3 shows minimal differences in lipids and BP so please note this in text and reconcile this, especially for BP, with your comments on figure 1 in the text.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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