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Reviewer's report:

This is a really interesting paper which provides an overview of the development of educator roles within the field of diabetes. The method of evaluating the grey literature is also interesting and the use of this may well be worthy of a methodological paper as often this literature is ignored in traditional literature reviews. You justify the use of this tool and detail it sufficiently for the reader to have knowledge of the process.

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. 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.)

Line 18 replace 'diabetes education' with 'education of people with diabetes'.

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