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Reviewer's report:
The systematic review based on epidemiological studies pooled the SF-36 scores of patients with diabetes in Iran. The major concern of the study is that SF-36 was designed to evaluate the general health status, but not specific to the quality of life. As the aim of the study is to investigate the quality of life in patients with diabetes in Iran, SF-36 is not an ideal tool for the study.

1. The study should follow MOOSE statement rather than PRISMA statement.
2. As there is no control group in the study, the conclusion of the QoL being low was not fully evidence-based. The authors may wish to use the control from the case-control studies and the reports from other countries.
3. The information of the included studies were very limited. To be noted, pooling young patients with newly diagnosed diabetes and senior ones with established cardiovascular disease made no sense to the audience.
4. The authors did not differentiate type 1 and type 2 diabetes, which share diverse disease burden.
5. STROBE checklist may not be an ideal method for the quality assessment. Instead, ACROBAT-NRSI could be a better option.
6. Some information provided in table 1 may be typos, like 'mean' and 'duration'.

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

No
**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
No

**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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