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Reviewer’s report:

I want to thank the authors for taking the time to incorporate my suggestions. The paper addresses an important topic, because understanding barriers to access to diabetes care for patients in low income countries, and instituting policy to address these barriers is a critical requirement to address the rapid growth in prevalence of chronic disease on South Asia.

This being said, I am still concerned about the level of scientific rigor in this paper, and therefore the applicability of the results more broadly to Bangladesh. I understand that this is an exploratory qualitative study, but it is still important to explain the limitations of the sample on the generalizability of the results. The authors state in their comments that “interviewees were selected based on their willingness to talk about their treatment”. There is clearly a selection bias in this choice, yet the authors fail to discuss the limitations of this bias on their results. Similarly, only one rural site was chosen, and while diabetes is still an urban disease in Bangladesh, it is incomplete to base conclusions without stating the limitations of generalizing from data collected from a single facility.

The authors state that it is more logical not to segment their results by geography or socio-economics because it would detract from the logical presentation of emergent themes. While this may be the case, this reviewer would argue that it is more effective to present policy options if disparities in access to care is demonstrated in the data. Clearly, the sample sizes are too small for a detailed segmentation, but there is no segmentation even by gender, and in Bangladesh, gender plays a role in access to care. Being able to distinguish between male and female responses (or even to say that no gender differences are found if this is the case) would make the paper stronger.

In summary, this reviewer recommends a discussions on the limitations of this study, the potential effects of the choice of sites and the convenience sample of patients on the generalizability of the results, and at least some discussion about the differences or lack thereof across urban/rural and male/female divides. This should be a major compulsory revision. Even of the results are not presented in a segmented, these discussion will more accurately inform implications of policy and capacity building to meet the growing challenge of diabetes in Bangladesh.
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