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5th November 2014

Professor Damiani,
Editor,
BMC Health Services Research,
BioMed Central

Paper Title: Impact of diabetes on hospital admission and length of stay among a general population aged 45 year or more: a record linkage study.

Investigators: A/Prof Elizabeth Comino, Prof Mark Harris, Mr Md Fakhrul Islam, Dr Duong Thuy Tran, Prof Bin Jalaludin, A/Prof Jeff Flack, Prof Louisa Jorm, Prof Marion Haas

Dear Professor Damiani,

We are grateful for the comments from the two reviewers and for their time.

Please find attached a copy of our paper with further minor revisions as requested by one reviewer. Two of his comments (3 and 4) referred to our emendations. We have not included them as they did not add to the paper. We have incorporated the other changes changes into the document. The attached table details these changes.

The authors and their contact details have not altered. All have made substantial contribution to this work and have agreed to publication.

Yours Sincerely

A/Prof Elizabeth Comino
## Response to reviewers’ comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer comment</th>
<th>Response/action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewer: Daniel J Rubin</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It should be stated in the abstract and methods that this was a prospective cohort study.</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is stated: The sequence blocks were designed to take into account transfers and same day readmissions. Does this mean that transfers and same day readmissions were not counted as unique admissions? If so, this should be stated.</td>
<td>This has been added to the Abstract (Page 3, line 6) and methods (Page 6, line 19) section. Yes, these were treated as a part of the same admission. We have added the statement: ‘where these were recorded that were considered as a part of the same admission’ (Page 10, Line 23-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot;We included all variables associated with diabetes in the univariate analysis.&quot; This should be stated in the methods.</td>
<td>This was a statement for the reviewer. We do not think that further explanation is required in the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were the final models based on statistical significance, clinical significance, or something else? This should be stated in methods.</td>
<td>The final models were relatively simple and only adjusted for age and gender. This is already stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewer: Massimo Maurici</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read the authors' updated manuscript and their responses to the reviewers' comments. In my opinion they addressed all issues satisfactorily.</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>