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Reviewer’s report:

While the intentions of the authors are laudable, i.e., assessing the effectiveness of care management programs for patients with Type 2 diabetes, the manuscript contains a number of flaws.

Major Revisions:

The literature search strategy description notes “any language” yet the figure excludes non-US studies, so it doesn’t make sense to address language; what does “any population” mean?

A major flaw in this study is that care management is never defined, thus it is not clear how articles could be included or excluded based on that; also, what does “carved out” of Primary Care mean (I know what it means to me, but unsure about the definition in this study). Also, the study interventions varied widely across these studies, which is a significant limitation - this needs to be addressed.

Could the control group receive an attention control or lower intensity intervention, or were only usual care included?

Categorizing delivery method into one category biases findings toward the null, as shown in tables several studies (39%) used multiple delivery methods

The Study Description needs more detail (what did you collect for the description of the enrolled participants? What is intervention mode?)

Did you use a scale (Jadad?) for study quality assessment? In what way was study quality used in the analysis?

Page 10, when meta analysis was not feasible, under what conditions was it not feasible?

I found the Results section quite vague, and under referenced, e.g., page 14 “there were seventeen studies…with twelve reporting… Eight studies included…” none have references attached so it is not clear which studies are being referenced

What meta analysis approach was used? This is not referenced or described in adequate detail
The Discussion is underdeveloped

Minor Revisions:

Abstract mentions the study could inform the design of medical homes without adequate justification from the findings.

The opening paragraph focuses on the Chronic Care Model without adequately linking it to the purpose of the study, as it contains several mechanisms proposed to interact to improve care.

There are several sentences throughout that don’t make sense, and an example is in the second paragraph “to summarize the evidence of comparative effectiveness of care management modalities applied … across patient outcomes”. Also, the last part of the paragraph “advances in disease management that have favored type 2 diabetes”.

Unclear who the content experts are or how many there were

When listing criteria, the authors say “such as” (see page 9) meaning it is not clear if the list provided is the full list, or just examples
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