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Reviewer’s report:


A cross-sectional study in 35 of the 36 Irish public hospitals comparing numbers and types of health professionals, waiting times and patterns of discharge of outpatient diabetes care. A small well conducted and described study which gives a good view of the situation in Ireland in 2009. It’s a pity there were no results on numbers and type of patients treated (case-mix). A table with results would elucidate the article. No data were presented on staff training and education, structured patient education, audit and feedback and patient reminder system.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes, very good
3. Are the data sound? Yes, as far as I can see. But I miss data on staff training and education, structured patient education, audit and feedback. These were mentioned in the methods, but barely answered in the results section.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes, but I miss a clear table of the results (minor essential revision)
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes, but I miss the comparison to other national or international research in the discussion. Compare your findings to results of previous studies in Ireland or other countries for example the UK where almost the same questionnaire was used as well. (minor essential revision) It would be nice to be able to compare the referral behavior with the level of diabetes care in primary care in the same region. (A suggestion for future research)
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, briefly
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes, but very short. It looks like not all results are presented.
Some discretionary revisions:
• Use the same term for a profession: endocrinologist.
• Explain the abbreviation WTE

Minor Essential Revisions are mentioned above in point 4 and 5
There are no Major Compulsory Revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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