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Dear

BMC Health Services Research Editorial Office,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript entitled: ‘Diabetes distress in Indonesian patients with type 2 diabetes: a comparison between primary and secondary care’ BHSR-D-18-01610.

In the following sections we have addressed in detail the points raised by the statistical reviewer and replied to each point in turn. We think we have addressed all suggestions and feel the manuscript has been substantially improved.

All the authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the revised manuscript being submitted. The manuscript is not currently being considered elsewhere. If accepted, it will not be
We hope that the revised manuscript meets the high standards of your journal.

We thank you in advance for your consideration of our revised manuscript and look forward to your response.

Kind regards,

Bustanul Arifin,
Antoinette D.I. van Asselt,
Didik Setiawan,
Jarir At Thobari,
Maarten J. Postma, and
Qi Cao.

Editor Comments:

BMC Health Services Research operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:

1. The authors have addressed most of the comments. There are still a few clarifications that they need to add.

In Table 1, the variable "'complications'" is not clear. The sub categories need to add up to 100%. This variable needs to be listed in the following manner:
-no complication

-with one complication

-with two or more complications.

And all these three need to add up to 100%. The comparison between the groups is not clear. Which test was used to compare the sub categories of this variable?

We agree with the reviewer. In this revised manuscript we have followed the reviewer’s suggestion to change our Table 1 as follows:

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics, clinical condition and diabetes distress scores of the participants in primary care compared to those treated in tertiary care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Primary care (n = 108)</th>
<th>Tertiary care (n = 524)</th>
<th>Overall (n = 632)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-demographic characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male sex</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age [years]*</td>
<td>62±9</td>
<td>60±10</td>
<td>60±10</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (I/II/III)#,***</td>
<td>10%/40%/50%</td>
<td>31%/34%/35%</td>
<td>29%/35%/36%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanied by caregiver</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes duration [years]*</td>
<td>5 (1-14); N=31</td>
<td>4 (1-10); N=312</td>
<td>5 (1-10); N=343</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of therapy (I/II/III/IV)$,***</td>
<td>11%/67%/14%/8%</td>
<td>2%/57%/24%/17%</td>
<td>5%/59%/22%/14%</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting blood glucose (FBG) [mg/dL]</td>
<td>130 (112-134); N=9</td>
<td>140 (115-179); N=249</td>
<td>140 (115-180); N=258</td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postprandial glucose [mg/dL]</td>
<td>167 (160-184); N=9</td>
<td>192 (151-236); N=234</td>
<td>190 (153-236); N=243</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complications

No complication 47% 33% 32% 0.576

With one complication 33% 37% 36% 0.116

With two or more complications* 17% 23% 26% 0.011

With other serious diseases* 3% 7% 6% 0.011

Diabetes distress

Total score*** 28 (21-41) 21 (18-30) 23 (18-35) <0.001

Emotional burden*** 8 (6-11) 6 (5-9) 7 (5-10) <0.001

Physician distress*** 7 (5-10) 5 (4-7) 5 (4-8) <0.001

Regimen distress*** 9 (6-13) 6 (5-9) 7 (5-11) <0.001

Interpersonal distress*** 4 (3-6) 3 (3-5) 3 (3-6) <0.001

Continuous variables are presented as mean ± standard deviation or median (interquartile range), and categorical variables are presented as percentages.

#Occupation I, II, III respectively stand for active employee, unemployed, and housewife

$Type of therapy I, II, III, IV respectively stand for Diet or no drugs, OAD, Insulin, Insulin+OAD

***P<0.001; **P<0.01; *P<0.05

2. Another concern relates to the variable ""with comorbidity"". The sample is relatively elderly (mean age 60 SD 10 years) and having just 6% with comorbidities seems unlikely. Clearly this study misses many comorbidities that this sample could have had.

We agreed with the reviewer that “with comorbidity” might not be a proper way to define this characteristic. In this revised manuscript we have therefore replaced ‘with comorbidity’ with ‘other serious diseases’ with its corresponding definition mentioned.
3. The symbol ~ is incorrectly used. This symbol means "approximately". The authors incorrectly used this symbol. Please change in all confidence intervals and other figures relating to a range. The correct symbol should be –

In this revised manuscript we have replaced the symbol ‘~’ with ‘-’.