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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this is a simple and concise well-written manuscript for a study that has never been done in Indonesia. Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. The methods are generally appropriate, although some clarification should be provided. Specific comments follow.

1. Page 5 Line 7. I expect that definition of primary/secondary care will refer to the facility. In the manuscript, it was described as patient who got treatment at the facility. How patient allocated to health facility also not fit with sub-heading. I recommend to create a separate new sub-heading describing study context and setting.

2. Page 5 line 24. It is not clear how many hospital were involved and whether they are all teaching hospital. If all patient were supervised and managed by resident, what is the role of the specialist in the management of diabetic patient, and is this model also reflect the practice in non-teaching hospitals? It is also not clear whether management of DM described in the text referred to the national guideline of DM management in Indonesia or specific guideline from the hospital. Again, detail description of DM management in hospital is not really fit with the sub-heading.

3. Page 6 line 4. What does "a consulting resident of internal medicine in private clinic" means?

4. Page 6 line 10. Instrument. Does the instrument has been tested before? Who, when, where the test was conducted, and what are the validity and reliability results?

5. Page 6 line 34. In a paper from Fisher et al., about the development of DD instrument, it was described that DD score was measured from the average of items score and not the sum of scores. Following the original guideline of the instrument will allow comparison with the original study.
6. Page 6 line 59. There is a potential selection bias for only recruiting patient who came to the weekly educational program, because i assume only patient who adhere/comply to treatment will come to the meeting, while those with lack of motivation or lack of access to health facilities will only visit the hospital for treatment or when they get really sick, as mentioned in the introduction.

7. Page 10 Table 1. Overall average total score of DD was only 23, with maximum score of 35. This is far from the maximum score of 102 and much closer to the based score of 17 which defined as not a problem. Looking at the average total score, i guess most respondent expressed lack of distress due to diabetes. Looking at the average score for each dimension, i guess majority of respondent have selected score 1 or 2 for each items and if i referred back to the original guideline, score 1 and 2 were defined as "not a problem". Therefore, describing that some patients have significantly higher distressed level can be misleading.

8. Page 11 Table 2. Despite its p-value, it is more important to describe its odds value. For example: odds for age is 0.97 and FBG 1,01 are both very close to 1 which shows no differences. Description in the text is misleading.

9. Page 12. Discussion. The questionnaire was mostly asked patient's long term experienced with Diabetes, and it is not clear how the transformation of health insurance system will influence the Distress Score. The author can highlight specific items of the questionnaire to support this hypothesis.

10. The author should look back to the result and create conclusion based on the result. I think it is also interesting to show that majority of Diabetes patient in Indonesia does not experience major distressed. However, data collection methods should be highlighted as well, the fact that data collection was conducted in public area may lead to under-reporting of patient's experience and psychological situation.
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