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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors

You did a magnificent job conducting successfully this research. The research aimed at a very important issue that is the cognitive representations of diabetes within adult and older adult population. Since the prevalence of diabetes is so high in Saudi Arabia, as you pointed out in the article, the justification and need for this study is clear.

Also, the methodology seems very cautious, respecting the representativeness of the sample (no adult age group was left out), the selection and translation of the main measure, and all the statistical procedures seem very well done; its presentation is understandable.

There is however some worries that I want to raise for your consideration:

1) The title is excessively long and taking into account the main goal of the paper, it seems obvious that there is not the need to have a so long title (12 words are commonly seen as the maximum adequate and this title has 16), that there are good alternatives more economical.

2) There was no discussion about the poor cronbach alfa of the majority of subscales…!! and since you have so high methodological care this seems contradictory. it appears that you trusted the measure but you didn't care about its validation.

3) I have some doubts if your perspective about the use and utility of "The Illness Perception Questionnaire" is adequate. It seems that you did try to match the participants cognitive representations of the disease with the objective data about it; when you did find the match, you didn't see any problem to discuss; The main problem of this approach is that there were a lot of data not explored from the patients's point of view. Looking for what health care system can do to assist patients and some of the patients specifically (for
instance one quarter of participants strongly agree that diabetes is a mystery and this could mean that it is perceived as unmanageably). for instance you said in Page 8, line 47: "These symptoms are associated with diabetes itself, or with medication effects, which showed that patients had appropriate knowledge of their disease". "Apropriate"? This measure was constructed to be targeted toward the cognitive representations of the five components of the disease and not to explore if they know "what" it is the disease according the scientific inquiry.

4) there is a contradiction between the extension of data and its importance and the so brief conclusions or suggestions you did with your data (see for instance the conclusion in your abstract)

5) Just wondering in Page 8, line 49: you state: "While managing patients, it is important to educate them on how to identify and manage symptoms, as those with a good understanding of it were able to identify the most probable causes, including eating habits and hereditary factors". Take into account that those with good understanding were not educated.... if those patients were able to identify these symptoms without education, we should wonder why it is necessary to help them....

6) Respecting the tables and figures:

a. There is no table formatted according simple canonical rules. The tables presented are from spss without any canonic formatting.

b. The figure 1 is dispensable. There is a disproportion between the magnitude of this figure and its importance. It would be a nice figure to do a powerpoint presentation but it is not adequate for a research paper.

c. Figure 2 and figure 3 were not done according basic norms of parsimony in presenting figures. See for instance https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/20/

I would like you take into account these brief notes that do not lessen merit to your research but if taking into account they could improve a lot the paper.

Thank you for reading this and congratulations for your research

José Ferreira-Alves
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I am not a native English speaker or writer; then I am not sure if there is some corrections to be done.

The statistics look well done.

The conclusions do not support the data but in a singular sense; they underuse the data perhaps because they do not understand fully the potentialities of the measure.
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