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Reviewer's report:

- It is important that the authors justify the cutoff point for the adopted glycated hemoglobin (> 9%). I considered this cutoff point very high. Around the world, for example, the most clinical guidelines for diabetes management stipulate a cutoff point (> 7%) as a negative predictor in people with diabetes. Besides that, there is a consensus (among endocrinologists and diabetologists researchers) that the change in <1% has a significant clinical and therapeutic representativeness in people with diabetes. One suggestion, if possible, would be to stratify at least two cutoff points for glycated hemoglobin (7% and 9%, respectively). In this way, the findings presented would be more diversified and would better indicate the impact of the proposed protocol.

- In the Introduction, I suggest that the authors describe succinctly, in a single paragraph, the differential in their proposal from this protocol in relation to the others already presented in the background.

- I suggest that the authors substitute the expression blood sugar for glycemia.

- Even though the qualitative phase of this research has already been published, it would be interesting to comment about the phenomenological framework adopted. Since the authors mentioned only the content analysis in this current version.

- Authors need to review the final writing of the paper as well, since in some moments the verbs are in the past, and in others in the future. Before the final acceptance of this paper this item must be revised.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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