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Reviewer's report:

This is a nicely written updated meta-analyses of the relationship between diabetes and bladder cancer.

My first comment relates to the that even though this is an updated meta-analyses of the topic I am not sure whether any clarification is gained and it actually poses more uncertainty.

Specific comments:

1. I am concerned that the I2is very high is some cases and thus these results become non sensible.

2. I was not able to ascertain whether any attempt was made to assess quality of the studies.

3. Men get more bladder cancer than women, so the lack of significant in the women’s result may be an issue of power.

4. p value are not necessary when a CI is reported. Also, a p value of 0.000 does not make sense. It is p<0.001.

5. The fact that duration of diabetes was inversely associated with bladder cancer is perplexing. Was this data gleamed from the case control or cohort studies.

6. This should be done using cohort not case control to avoid issues of reverse causation.

7. The introduction is long and could benefit from editing.

8. Were any of the cohort studied occupational cohorts?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
Declaration of competing interests:

This is a nicely written updated meta-analyses of the relationship between diabetes and bladder cancer.

My first comment relates to the that even though this is an updated meta-analyses of the topic I am not sure whether any clarification is gained and it actually poses more uncertainty.

Specific comments:

1. I am concerned that the I2 is very high in some cases and thus these results become non-sensible.

2. I was not able to ascertain whether any attempt was made to assess quality of the studies.

3. Men get more bladder cancer than women, so the lack of significant in the women’s result may be an issue of power.

4. p value are not necessary when a CI is reported. Also, a p value of 0.000 does not make sense. It is p<0.001.

5. The fact that duration of diabetes was inversely associated with bladder cancer is perplexing. Was this data gleamed from the case control or cohort studies.

6. This should be done using cohort not case control to avoid issues of reverse causation.

7. The introduction is long and could benefit from editing.

8. Were any of the cohort studied occupational cohorts?