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Reviewer's report:

The revisions and response to referees seem appropriate and thorough. Two minor comments:

Response to referee 1, number 2: The external validation comparison with UK data is a bit 'asymmetric' with the DM prevalence in model being higher at younger ages and lower at older ages. Why? Is this acceptable? For example, Danish modelling studies show a profound fall in DM prevalence at older ages (due to competing mortality I assume) as does this UK model, but it is not match with English prevalence data. Why? Evolution of trends over time? If the model is not correct here, what impact would it have on modelled cost effectiveness results?

Response to referee 1, number 3: A footnote to Table 3 for similarly confused readers might help? (I do not think this has been done.)
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