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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript addresses an important topic, with real implications for health care practice and enhanced education of health care professionals. As requested I have focused my attention on the method used to examine the open ended questions, which are described by the authors as ‘qualitative’. I also include some comments about other aspects of the manuscript.

Major comments

1. In the Analysis section, the authors state that a content analysis strategy was applied to answers from the open ended questions. However, a content analysis approach as described here is not appropriate and I am unclear why this was used rather than a simple item by item assessment of the ‘correctness’ of the participants’ answers, much in the same way that an exam might be marked. In the first section of the description of the ‘content analysis’, the approach as described by the authors would normally be used to identify common categories across answers, rather than to assess their correctness. The second part of the description of the ‘content analysis’ strategy refers to categorising the questionnaire items (not the answers). This is a different issue and should be described separately.

2. The description of questionnaire validation requires more detail: the authors state that content validity was assessed by Endocrinologists and nurses: how was this done?

Other comments

1. The language is generally adequate, but requires some editing: there are some grammar corrections to be made as well as some word changes (e.g. removal of ‘lethal’).

2. The Rubin article cited and acknowledged by the authors describes a 21 item questionnaire, how does the 20 item questionnaire described in this manuscript differ? It would be important to say.

3. In the Introduction, the authors state: “There are several studies that have looked into the issue of diabetes related knowledge of nurses and physicians [7-9] but the data assessing the knowledge of diabetes among trainee residents’ is limited in this region.” This is a little misleading as it conflates evidence from research with nurses and physicians in other contexts with trainee residents in this region. Better to say something like: There are several studies that have
looked into diabetes related knowledge among health care professionals [refs]. In Pakistan, such work includes……. [refs]. However, but there has been no exploration of diabetes knowledge of nurses and trainees in Pakistan… The authors could then continue with their argument about why this is important.

4. In Methods, the authors state that participation was ‘voluntary ‘and they state that informed consent was ‘taken’. Was consent in writing? It would also be good to clarify and describe in one place the processes of identification of potential participants, approach, informed consent and administration of the questionnaires, at the moment this information is somewhat scattered through the manuscript which makes it hard to follow.

**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.
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