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Reviewer’s report:

Impact of Care Management Processes and Integration of Care on Blood Pressure Control in Diabetes

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

There is no research question stated but the aim of the study was stated: “We sought to evaluate the relationship between care management processes (CMP), integration of services, and blood pressure (BP) control among diabetic patients.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

• The methods were presented and the research design (cross-sectional, retrospective record review) is clearly stated but the Methods section was difficult to follow:

• For example, in the abstract the following was included: 28 US physician organizations (n=2,162). What does (n=2, 162) mean?

• In the methods section, the data collection procedure was not made clear. It was not clear how the physician organizations were selected (I believe convenience sampling). Also, how the patient sample was randomized was not stated.

• A recommendation is that the authors present exclusion and exclusion criteria more clearly and in more organized fashion for both the sites and the patients.

• The dates of data collection are not included.

• It is recommended that subheadings be used when describing variables included in the list of patient demographics and site characteristics. This would enhance readability. The conceptual and operational definitions as well as the level of measurement also should be included in a more organized fashion.

• It is recommended that the analysis methods be presented in a more organized fashion: Patient demographics, site demographics, overall description of the scores from the two measurement instruments (care management processes (CMP) and integration of services) and analyses related to the research question (correlations).

3. Are the data sound?
Yes the data appears to sound but I am not familiar with Glimmix (linear mixed models).

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

The authors need assistance in writing in a more organized fashion. Some editorial issues: US should be spelled out first before using the abbreviation. Reporting standard deviations were not reported in a consistent manner (results section). The results section was difficult to follow and needs subheadings: Description of Sites; Patient Characteristics; Mean Scores from the measurement instruments; and then Results from the correlations to answer the research question.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

I do not agree with the conclusions the authors make regarding “approaching statistical significance”. Data either are statistically significant or not. There was minimum/limited support for the association of CMP and Service integration.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Yes. I think the limitations are clearly stated in the Discussion Section.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Yes. However, the overview of the prior research should be included in the Background section under a subheading of Literature Review not in the Discussion section. Once presented in the Background, the author can refer back to the research in the discussion.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?

The authors require assistance in the organization of the manuscript so that the reader can more readily understand the research.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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