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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript is an interesting study of Indonesian primary care practitioners and their awareness, agreement, adoption and adherence to type 2 diabetes guidelines. However, there are a number of revisions that need to be made throughout the manuscript which are detailed in the report below.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Background
Page 4, references need to provided for ‘diabetes being a complex condition’ and a reference for ‘diabetes being a emerging health problem in Indonesia’.

The authors also refer to international diabetes guidelines – again references need to be provided to make it clear as to which international guidelines they are referring to here.

It would useful to the read if the authors included a sentence on whether similar studies have been carried out in other countries. At the moment, it’s difficult to understand the need for this study, what the study adds and how future research can benefit from the findings?

The authors claim to have developed a questionnaire but do not provide any information on why they did not carry out any psychometric testing which is crucial when developing a questionnaire. Or was it that they modified an existing questionnaire? This needs to be clarified in further detail together with a justification for psychometric testing was not carried out.

The recruitment strategy needs further clarity. The questionnaire was administered to primary care practitioners at an annual conference. More detail needs to be provided on how the questionnaire was administered to primary care practitioners at the conference and why was this deemed an appropriate place to recruit practitioners as appose to approaching them at their practices? Was the questionnaire administered face-to-face? Or was it included in the delegates pack?

A section on the limitations of the study needs to be included in the discussion. For example, what are the limitations of using a questionnaire? What are the limitations of the recruitment strategy? What would a mixed methods design have added? Or even a qualitative study design?
More consideration needs to be made for the clinical implications of this study findings as well the implications for future research. E.g. would Indonesia benefit from a system like the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) that’s currently in place for primary care practitioners in the UK?

Minor Essential Revisions

Background
The authors need to define and describe the difference between type 1 and type 2 diabetes. Perhaps even consider abbreviating the term type 2 diabetes using (T2D or T2DM).

It would be helpful if the authors could justify why they did not assess knowledge of the diabetes guidelines.

Results
Missing data
With 15% missing data for respondent characteristics, why did the authors choose to impute data using mean or median as appose to regression imputation?

For an international audience – it would be helpful if the authors could define what they mean by ‘solo practice’ and ‘practiced in Java’.

Typo – first paragraph – Adherence to screening has (had) no missing data….

Discussion
Paragraph 2 – what do the authors mean by ‘random blood glucose’? Are they referring to HbA1c? This needs to be clarified.

Re-write: the word ‘apparently’ to discuss the study findings. Please consider another word e.g. the majority of our respondents believed it was more appropriate….

Paragraph 5 – typo in the last sentence. The word ‘participants’ is used instead of ‘respondents’.

The last sentence on the study response rate needs to be moved to the results section.

Conclusion
Typo e.g. In Indonesian – should read in Indonesian.

Doesn’t – ‘does not’ would be better.

The first sentence needs to be re-phrased highlighting the key findings and messages of this study. Again, the authors need to consider (a sentence) on the clinical implications of the study findings as well the implications for future research.
Discretionary Revisions
None

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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