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Reviewer’s report:

The article presented for the review describes the correlation between the diabetes mellitus type 2 and depressive symptoms in the Palestinian population. In the reviewer opinion this is an extremely important article for a few reasons. First of all, the information on DM and depression in the Arabic countries are scant; we are still lacking the data from that region of the World. Secondly, the study was very well designed and performed. Thirdly, the quality of the paper is high and the text is easy to follow. And finally, there are only few critical remarks that should be addressed. Those remarks are written below.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. BDI II is a screening tool. One cannot diagnose depression based on this instrument. All individuals who scored 16 or more points in BDI II should be referred for further consultation. I would suggest to clarify that fact in the MS and add that information to the Material and Method section
2. What laboratory method was used to measure the HBA1C levels? Was the NGSP criteria met?
3. In some areas, particularly Southeast Asia, there is a significant prevalence of hemoglobin variants that might influence the HBA1C levels. Could you please add some information on that in the MS?
4. Why in the multivariate analysis not all variables were included, e.g HBA1C? I understand that only variables that were statistically significant in the univariate analysis were included in the multivariate one. If so, that information should be added to the Statistical methodology description.
5. Could you please discuses the possible differences in the prevalence of depression in DM patients between this study and other studies? Maybe the possible cause is that in the authors study BDI II was used to diagnose the depression, in other studies - DSM-IV criteria for depression?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Please provide the time frame when the study was conducted?
2. The information of the mean medication number and median is redundant
3. In case of HBA1C the authors should decide if they present mean or median (depending on the normality)
4. In the sentence: “Multivariate analysis showed that: 1) diabetic patients with
college education have lesser odds [O.R = 0.24; (0.087 – 0.664)] of depression than those with lesser level of education, 2) diabetic patients with no current job have higher odds [O.R =2.77 (1.23 – 6.265)], of depression than those who are currently working, 3) diabetic patients with multiple additional illnesses have higher odds [O.R = 1.807 (1.049 – 3.113)] of depression than those with # 1 additional illness, and finally 4) diabetic patients with high medication adherence score have lesser odds [O.R = 0.31 (0.18 – 0.529)] of depression than those with low (<6) medication adherence score”. I would suggest to use “were less/more likely to have depression” rather than “have lesser/higher odds”

5. Some minor punctuation errors should be corrected.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Please explain what cardiac problems and renal problems did the patients report

2. The depression symptoms score distribution was positively skewed with the majority of participants [174 (59.2%)] scored less than 16 while 120 (40.2%) patients scored # 16 in the depression scale – please change to [n=174, 59.2%] in the brackets

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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