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Comments
Amendments in the revised version

Reviewer No. 1

I

The authors have responded to most of my comments and concerns.

I do have one remaining issue which I already mentioned before: Some people live >100km away from the closest monitor. You should do a sensitivity analysis by excluding participants living for example >50km away from a monitor and calculate new odds ratios. This way you can get an idea about the exposure measurement error.

Noted with thanks.

The authors have included a sensitivity analysis by excluding those who live more than 50 km away from a monitoring station and determined the new odds ratios (supplementary Fig. 2). The authors included the following statements into the discussion section “A sensitivity analysis to exclude those who are living outside 50 km radius from the air monitoring station was performed (supplementary Fig. 2) and only slight differences were noticed (OR of SO2 for overall diabetes of NHMS 2015, OR of PM10 for known diabetes of NHMS 2011, and ORs of O3, NO2 and NOx for underdiagnosed diabetes of NHMS 2015). Hence, exposure measurement error may contribute little impact to the observed association in this study. Other unknown factors may have contributed to the observed association.”

Reviewer No. 2

I

The authors addressed reviewers' comments and suggestions thoroughly. One additional suggestion is that the authors change the word 'controversial' throughout the manuscript to 'unclear' or 'mixed,' or other word choices.

Noted with many thanks. All the “controversial” words have been changed to “mixed” according to the reviewer’s suggestion.