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Reviewer's report:

The author did a great job by answering the majority of the point raised by the reviewer.

However, the reviewer has still some major concern and some of the previous points were not taken into account:

- Across the manuscript there are some typos (for example, no space before brackets, etc.). Please revise it.
- Be coherent with the decimals and write only 3 signficante number all across the manuscript.
- In “Data source”, authors said that unpublished articles were hand-searched. It is still not clear where these unpublished articles come from. Please provide the information.
- Regarding the part “methodological Quality Assessement”, the reviewer wish it it to be rewritten with a complete sentence. Moreover, the major concern of the reviewer is how this methodological quality assessment were taken into account through the results part. The authors said it was reported everywhere in the result section and tables but the reviewer cannot identified these information.
- Please provide reference for the values of the I² (25%, 50% and 75% indicated low, medium and high heterogeneity)
- Authors said in their review that they performed robustness analysis. So, it could be relevant to describe it in methods and results sections.
- In the “Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis”, authors still let the information “subgroup analyses were performed for the category of diabetes and types of meals”. Please, delete it.
- When authors relate some of the studies included in both review and meta-analysis, it could be better to insert references of these studies. For example, page 9 “some of the studies (n=4) included only patients who had no changed their treatment...”, please add references of the four studies concerned.
- The reviewer still think that table 2 and Table 1/or table 4 could be merged or that table 2 could be deleted. Indeed, no additional information is given in table 2 (correlations are also presented in table 4).
- Authors said that PGD is more specific than FPG. However, in table 3, only two studies showed a higher specificity for PPG (which is called PGD in the text
again) compared to FPG. Therefore, how can the authors concluded that PGD is more specific?
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