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Reviewer’s report:

General comments

The paper addresses an important issue and makes some interesting points but it does not contain any significantly new information.

Some editing is needed in places.

There are a lot of appendices that may not be needed in a journal article.

Specific comments

It is not clear why the background, page 7, is placed before the abstract. The paper does not flow logically.

Clarify whether the key words will help readers retrieve the paper.

Use 'people with diabetes' rather than diabetes patients.

Page 8

Indicate how the search algorithm was 'piloted'

Indicate why 'lack of information' was a search term. Often the design and layout and difficulty finding the information are issues rather than the fact that information is lacking.

Page 9

Indicate whether reference lists of the papers identified were searched.

Line 43 Indicate who decided 'the type of information needed by diabetes patients in general.' Is well documented that what health professionals think people need and what the people think they need are vastly different.

Page 11
Line 14 Clarify what sustainability means in the context of the sentence.
Indicate whether the criteria for writing readable and comprehensible information were considered in any studies and by the authors.

Page 13

Line 33 Clarify whether children were participants in Roper et al's study, if so, what was the age range, and whether they indicated they wanted to know the information listed. The language is not the language children generally use. Do health professionals decide what information was needed?
Similar comments apply to the information about older people.

Page 14

It would be useful to include information about the study aims and methods.

Page 16

Line 28 Indicate why dentists do not provide information about oral health. It is not common for GPs to do so.

Page 17

Line 28

Clarify what is meant by 'knowledge differences and correctness.' Also indicate whether you mean knowledge or information. If the latter accuracy might be a better term than correctness.

Page 18

Line 23 Indicate who decided people with diabetes had 'unmet needs.'

Page 19

Line 23 clarify what is meant by 'The overall quality of the studies was satisfying.' The word satisfying is most like the cause of the lack of clarity.

The conclusion needs to address the study aim.
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