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**Reviewer’s report:**

“REVISION1: Impact of Communicative and Critical Health Literacy on Understanding of Diabetes Care and Self-efficacy in Diabetes Management: A Cross-sectional Study of Primary Care in Japan”

The authors did a commendable job responding to reviewer concerns. However, some additional concerns should be addressed.

Major compulsory revision:

Reviewer 1, Major compulsory revision #6: It is fine if the authors do not want to present all of the models in tables, but all significant results (e.g., those regarding covariates) should at least be reported in the text.

Reviewer 3, Minor essential revision #11: The internet use findings reported on p. 19 of the Discussion section should be reported in the Results.

Minor essential revision:

Reviewer 1, Minor essential revision #4: Regarding the patient-physician communication scale, did the authors check the internal consistency of the scale. If the scale is internally consistent, it can be used in analyses as opposed to the single perceived clarity item.

Reviewer 1, Major compulsory revision #8: The authors may want to explain how their findings differ from the “previous study” mentioned on p. 18.
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