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Reviewer's report:

Overall, it is a very well written paper on important issues for the management of diabetes. The presented data are essential for public health and may contribute to improve patient outcomes in this patient population. I have a few comments to be addressed, and some suggestions which may be used in this paper or be addressed in a separate study.

Comments to be addressed in this paper:

1. Page 2, Line 15: NHANES - should be spelled out in the abstract

2. Page 6, Line 41: Federal poverty level - it would help to get at least one sentence of description particularly for non-US readers

3. Page 11, Line 29: SES - this abbreviation appears for the 1st time here and needs to be spelled out

4. Discussion: How do HEI scores look in general population, or other diseased population? Please, include it in the discussion, it would give better understanding of the problem and a wider perspective

5. Figure in the main manuscript and Figures 1a-c in the revised supplemental tables: the HEI scale ranges from 0-100, and thus the y axis should be anchored 0-100. I agree that then the chart will be much less powerful and the differences may disappear. Nevertheless, showing it in the way as it is now, causes a severe misinterpretation and is perceived as manipulation. Maybe you could use different way of presenting these data.

Suggestions:

Overall I miss the analysis vs. the clinical data. I would suggest analysing impact of

1. type of diabetes
2. duration of diabetes
3. medication for diabetes
4. HbA1c
5. BMI

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 recommend additional statistical review
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