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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for accepting the manuscript for publication and for your comments. I have responded below.

Reviewer #1

[In the background section I would consider giving a bit more detail on the macro, meso and micro levels that you refer to, this will give the reader an understanding of these]

I take your point and have moved the description of these levels from the synthesis and analysis section to the background section.

[Why have you just included Australia, can this be generalized to the overall population. If you are only including Australia then this should be included in the title.]
This is a fair point. I justify the use of Australian documents only as it appears that different countries recognise diabetes educators and the practice of diabetes education in different ways. In the interest of presenting a coherent and meaningful historical analysis of the Australian diabetes educator workforce, a decision was made to include only Australian literature. This is explained further now in the Search Results section. I have made it clear in the title that this analysis is focused on Australia also.

[Page 6, line 20 - the full version of STARLITE should be mentioned in the first instance of this.]

This has been amended.

[Page 7, lines 9-21 - consider adding this into the background section.]

Thank you, I have moved this as mentioned above.

[Has anything more been published since December, can another search be carried out to identify any more documents that could be included in order to make this as current as possible.]

I have repeated the searches described in the manuscript on 14/06/2017 and can confirm that no further relevant documents have been published by ADEA or other in peer reviewed journals. Table 2 and Figure 2 have been updated accordingly.

[Page 12, lines 5-11, sentence needs reworded as it is difficult to understand.]

I have reworded in an attempt to make the sentence more clear. Please let me know if I have not succeeded.
In general you present your audience with a lot of information, can any of this content, in particular in the results section be reduced and perhaps more added into your discussion section.

Point taken. I have transferred some information from the results section to the discussion section where possible. I have also removed one paragraph from the results section that on reflection, is not critical to this analysis.

In the discussion section you have identified three key macro level drivers however, you have made no reference to meso or micro level drivers, can these additional two drivers be discussed or some reference made to these as they have been included in the background and the synthesis and analysis section.

As suggested, I have referred to these two levels in the discussion section.

You have excluded two international papers, it would be useful to consider these if you wanted to included more than just Australian documentation.

As I have completed a documentary data search of the professional association website in addition to the database search, it is thought that the same would need to be completed for all relevant international professional association bodies if international comparisons were to be made. As such, it is thought that the inclusion of these two documents may complicate the analysis without contributing any real value.

Have you referenced all of the 52 documents that you have included in your analysis?

I have not. This is an oversight which I have now corrected. This documentary analysis forms part of a larger PhD thesis. In order to make the analysis 'publishable' it has been edited. In the original, larger documentary analysis, 46 (not 52, error on my part) documents have been included and referenced. Only 40 of these documented have been cited in this edited analysis. Two of these are personal communication and cited as such. These do not appear in the reference
list. Therefore only 38 documents have been included in the reference list. I have presented all 46 references, including the episodes of personal communication in a new appendix (Appendix 1) with URLs where available for the more recent documents. Please let me know if this approach is not satisfactory.

I have also made some amendments to Appendix 2 (which was previously titled Appendix 1) and to the PRISMA diagrams (Figures 1 and 2) as required.

[In appendix one it indicates that the search was undertaken on the 08/09/2016, has any more recent searches been carried out?]

The first comprehensive literature search was carried out on 08/09/2016. Since then I have completed further searches. The most recent on 14/06/2017 to ensure all relevant documents have been retrieved and included.

Reviewer #2

[The writing is very clear and the paper is well constructed. However, I do feel that as the focus is Australia then this needs to be reflected in the title.]

Thank you, I have incorporated Australia into the title accordingly.

[There is reference to previous work in the background section line 9-11 and two of the references (1-4) relate directly to Australia. This focus needs to be made clear throughout the paper at this point (e.g. line 20 add in '...in Australia') and also in the discussion (add at the end of line 16 after ...policy (...in Australia.))]

Point taken. I have amended accordingly.
Amended accordingly, thank you.

[If you think the results may have more generalizability or transferability it may be worth adding a small paragraph in the discussion about this.]

Yes I do and have added a small paragraph at the end of the discussion.