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Reviewer's report:

The overall conclusion, that there is not a difference in overall risk for vildagliptin vs. rosiglitazone/pioglitazone, except that dizziness is reduced for the rosiglitazone/pioglitazone group seems well supported by the data, with the OR CI .81-1.24 within acceptable bounds. The other findings seem to either be post-hoc (comparisons to rosiglitazone only) or not supported by statistically significantly different results (e.g. weight gain). Results which are post-hoc must be separated and distinguished, and no claim of difference can be made for non-statistically significant difference in Odd Ratio. I have attached a Word documents with comments.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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