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Reviewer's report:

Congratulations to the authors on this substantial and timely manuscript. My review of this manuscript comes from two lenses: a) systematic review methods (realist review); and b) research interests in diabetes in older adults. I have not major concerns with this manuscript, however I will make some minor queries related to points a and b above.

With respect to methods, can the authors explain:

1) what is meant by "decisions made at different points in time were recorded in an excel spreadsheet" - is this referring to 2 reviewers screening independently? if so, what happened in the case of discrepancies?

2) what is meant by 'good enough and relevant enough' (page 5 - line 52). Does this imply data saturation?

3) On page 6 Line 51, the authors note the countries for which the studies were completed. Canada is missing...reference #93. And in true Canadian fashion, I will apologize (sorry) for pointing this out.

With respect to the research interests/content...I would like the authors to consider:

1) rewording some of the language in the last paragraph before strengths and limitations (Page 13, line 27). There are some long, awkward sentences and terms that are a bit outdated (i.e. Disciplines)

2) Recognizing that the main and fundamental limitation is the limited evidence related to management of diabetes in PLWD and that the authors note (page 14 - line 20) that the evidence does not consider BOTH conditions, I would suggest the authors address the issue of limited evidence from the context of multimorbidity and the colinearity of the conditions
(diabetes + dementia + many more) and what 'further work' needs to be done. This could be added in the conclusions section (Page 14, line 42).

Otherwise, there are a few typos or extra words. A thorough review for syntax and grammar should be completed.

Thank you.
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