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Reviewer’s report:

The topic and instrument is interesting, and the study have some strenghts, especially all the instruments included to assess construct validity.

My main concern is the main conclusion drawn from the study: "The psychometric properties are moderate but acceptable for clinical use ...". I am not convinced about this. The psychometric results and conclusions should be discussed in relation to criteria for internal consistency and test-retest reliability, for instance as described in Terwee et al (2007): http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0895435606001740 . The abstract and discussion part should be adjusted accordingly, and also include some recommendations for further research before use of the instrument in practice. Please also define and clarify "clinical" use, since use of instruments for individual patients would require even stronger psychometric performance than use at the group level.

Introduction: why did you choose these three questions for the study? Please elaborate on the background for this choice. Why not factor structure, item-total correlations, responsiveness? I suggest to place the ethical part in the Methods.

Methods:

Construct validity: was data collection procedure standardized between test and retest?
Statistical analysis: why did you only calculate the total score for those who answered all items? Normally, half or more are considered enough. How did you measure HbA1c and other clinical variables?

Tables:

Table 1: please clarify if this is respondent samples.
Table 2: why did you not include the sub-scores? Why not use the ICC instead of Spearman's?
Table 3: there's several significant negative correlations, please explain.
Table 4: same as for table 3, please explain.

Table 5: The severe distress column looks somewhat displaced and is not intuitive when compared to the other columns. Again, there's both positive and negative significant correlations, the readers might need a short explanation.

Figure 1: this is not only the translation process, adjust or change title.

Figure 2: I found this figure difficult to understand, an explanation below the figure is needed. One alternative is to skip this figure and only describe main results in the Results.

I lack a table with item-missing, mean, sd, ceiling effect, and floor effects for items.

Can the questionnaire be included as an appendix?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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