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Reviewer’s report:

In this manuscript Asma Ahmed and co-authors present the findings of a multi-center study about the diabetes related knowledge among residents and nurses in Karachi, Pakistan. In this interesting study the authors highlighted the overall knowledge gap among study participants. They also emphasize the need of interventions to improve the knowledge about diabetes care among health care providers.

Diabetes is emerging very rapidly in developing countries with no exception to Pakistan. It is very important for health care providers to have proper knowledge about management and control of diabetes. Authors are to be appreciated for their nice work on such an important topic.

However, the submitted manuscript should be revised to have more scientific vigor as well as better understanding and interpretation of results.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Abstract: Abbreviations should be spelled out first time. Expletive words like 'surprising' are not encouraged to use in any section of manuscript except in discussion section. Authors should have clear understanding of world 'significant'. What authors wants to explain here? Is it significant statistically? or is it means 'major/ noteworthy'? If it is not statistically significant, than it should be replaced noteworthy, high, major and so on.

2. Objectives of the study are not very clear for the readers, should be rephrased.

3. Methods: Where pilot testing of questionnaires conducted? Was it one of the same hospitals of final study? What was average time duration to fill out questionnaire?

4. Tables: Headings and subheading of table 1 are not clear enough. For example, it is not clear that how many questions were included to assess the knowledge about outpatient management.

5. Discussion: To make the clear understanding, author should discuss the limitations of their study in more detail.

6. References: Some references are quite old, should be replaced by new and updated references. Citations of some references are inappropriate and inaccurate.
Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract: Description of the results is vague, need to be rephrased.

2. Background: Literature search is not sufficient enough to describe the background with strong rationale of this study. There should be extensive and directional literature to support rationale. Authors mentioned that "Evidence suggest that by improving the glycemic control, these "

3. Methods: How open ended responses were grouped, coded and scored? What method was used to score the responses cumulatively? Were the level of training and working identical in all hospitals? Probably not! Authors are suggested to give description about studied hospitals particularly in reference to training and education of nurses and residents. How and why these particular hospitals were selected? Which sampling method was used? What was the response rate and what was the proportion of unanswered questions? How sample size was calculated and does post-hoc sample size calculated? (if the proportion of non-respondents and unanswered questions were reasonably high). Describe the qualitative and quantitative variables of this study in some details.

4. Results: This section should be more specific, clear and focused according to the study objectives. Figure 2 describing knowledge score comparison of four groups while in figure 1 only two groups were compared, why?

5. Discussion: This section is deficient in literature citation and conceptual debate. Study results should be compared and discussed with local, regional and international literature. There is no need to give numerical numbers again in discussion section.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.