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Reviewer's report:

The author was very clear and thorough in the response.
I am not comfortable with the note that questions will be answered in a second manuscript currently under review. I believe that a manuscript should contain all the needed information. The response item number 2 does not, to my reading, address the concern raised by Dr. Bosworth who queries the content rigor of the proposed diabetes numeracy test as compared to standard assessment tools used in education. I assume that Dr. Bosworth was not promoting the use of the WRAT in clinical settings. I must say that I could not promote the use of this new assessment tool in clinical settings either. I remain uncomfortable with the recommendation that this one half hour test is useful in clinical practice or for diagnostic education purposes.

At the same time, I appreciate the lessons learned from the administration of this test with the convenience sample of patients. These lessons resonate with other findings about the unsuitability of health materials -- materials that prove to be ill designed and poorly written. We do not design tools for patients' easy use.

The authors did address my concern that clinicians may not know what to do in face of test results. However, I do not agree that this diagnostic tool for health educators will prove useful. The 30 minutes needed for the assessment may well be applied to an in-depth education opportunity -- time that is scarce in clinical settings.

Overall, I find the insights to be very valuable. I clearly have a philosophic difference with the authors about the value of testing at this point and the use of a diabetes specific numeracy assessment tool.

I suggest that the editors consider my 'bias' and turn to Dr. Bosworth's re-assessment. If he feels as I do then I clearly restate my recommendation about a re-framing or non-publication. However, if Dr. Bosworth feels at ease with the changes made, then by all means consider a third reviewer who can look at the new manuscript and weigh in.