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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) The authors state that they have selected 5 sites to represent "different geographic regions and local demographics". But there is no further information on why these specific sites were selected (I understand that they wanted to select a BIRDEM clinic and a BADAS hospital) but there is no information about why the others were selected, and why Sylhet district was selected instead of some other district. Moreover, one of the clinics is a "private practice" but there is no information if this represents a diabetes practice or just a general practitioner providing treatment and care.

2) Apart from gender, there is no information about the patients interviewed. Are they all from the same socio-economic class? Why do they go to the particular clinics they were interviewed in (at least those in Dhaka)? Have the only been to the clinic they were interviewed in or have they visited other clinics as well?

3) There is no information about the sampling or about the justification of sample size - why were there 3 interviewees from the private practice and 6 from the BIRDEM clinic? Is the sampling rate the same across the clinics? How were the patients selected?

4) The same question pertains to the providers. Are the providers diabetes specialists? Do they have similar qualifications? Why were they chosen?

5) The paper mentions the method of constant comparison. In this method, future data collection is guided by common or different themes that emerge as a result of comparisons. There is no mention of how the data collection for the study evolved, the themes that emerged, and the decisions that were made to conduct specific interviews based on these themes. Without this information, it is difficult to see how this study constitutes a constant comparison method.

6) While the study is supposed to "gain insight into patients' understanding of their diabetes and its management.", only a few quotes address this particular issue. Much of the paper focuses on the inability of patients to pay for their treatments. While this is important, it is not aligned with the stated purpose of the study.

7) Overall, the reporting of the results should be segmented by hospital type - the
authors should report the similarities and differences of care, access, information and cost for each type of hospital and identify any differences that exist between Dhaka and Sylhet districts. In addition, they should point out any differences that exist between men and women and across demographics/education/income and other differences among the patients. Similar segmentation needs to be done by providers.

Minor essential revisions

There are a few spelling and grammatical errors that should be corrected
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