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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

N/A - no experiments or analyses

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Very important paper that seeks to determine the quality of diabetes care by describing relevant clinical, process, and structural outcomes in a rural diabetes clinic in SSA.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Here are a few comments to consider:

Introduction

In line 76, probably better to say 'leading cause' instead of leading factor.

Otherwise the introduction is well-written and articulates the key gaps

Methods

Line 132, what qualifications do physician assistants hold?

Line 138, suggest rephrasing to 'patient's clinical need'

How did participants consent? Was this by virtue of just coming to the clinic?

What was the inclusion/exclusion criteria?

Often a paired t-test such as in this instance is used in tandem with some form of a regression analysis to identify factors that maybe associated with outcomes. Did the authors consider this?

The authors should explain how they calculated the sample size for this study.

Results

How many patients were approached?

Was there any difference between those who participated and those who did not?
Line 200, please state the IQR

Line 202, please provide the SD

Were there any reasons associated with loss to follow up e.g transfer of care and deaths?

What are the clinical and research implications of this study?

Whilst the authors have highlighted the limitations of this study, there is also scope to highlight the key strengths of the study.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

**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.

Yes

**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:
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