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Reviewer's report:

Thank you

You have adequately addressed the points I raised. I have some additional minor points.

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

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.

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

Physician density - better to say this differently - eg 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 726 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

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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