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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the Revision of the Manuscript, which has now improved significantly.

In my opinion, the Reader is now able to understand the nature and purpose of the study. Moreover, FLASH addresses an important aspect in the Treatment and Support of diabetic patients.

I still recommend that the authors cooperate with a professional statistician from the beginning of the study. The protocol is complex and the estimated sample size is high, it would therefore be a great pity if some interesting findings were lost by using inadequate statistical Analysis.

Moreover, the authors should reconsider if all of the questionnaires are essential. There seems to be some redundancy in the results that the plethora of questionnaires will provide.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
Quality of figures

All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

Statistical review

Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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