Reviewer's report

Title: Communication strategies in the prevention of diabetes type 2 and gestational diabetes in vulnerable groups: protocol for a scoping review

Version: 0 Date: 27 Nov 2018

Reviewer: Alexandra Maria Bodnaruc

Reviewer's report:

Dear authors and editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript.

In this manuscript, the authors presented the protocol for a systematic scoping aiming to identify and describe communication strategies in the prevention of type 2 and gestational diabetes among vulnerable groups.

While the subject of the proposed review is of interest, the content and quality of this manuscript need, in my opinion, major adjustments.

Below are my comments and suggestions.

Major points:

- There are too many missing references. Before submitting a manuscript to a journal, a more careful revision of its content is necessary.

- The overall flow of the introduction is fine; however, it does not convince the reader of the importance of this scoping review. There is not enough background on the link between types of communication strategies and the effectiveness of lifestyle-related interventions. There are also several other barriers to the effectiveness of prevention strategies and life-style related interventions - why focus on communication strategies? This should be clear after reading the Introduction section.

- It is also unclear to me why you are focusing on type 2 diabetes AND gestational diabetes (besides the fact that both T2DM and GDM's prevalence are increasing). Prevention strategies for T2DM will target a population that is quite different from that that would be targeted by prevention strategies for GDM. Why including both in the same scoping review? This should also be clearer in the introduction.

- The discussion of this manuscript is not a discussion per se, it is a copy paste of the objective and brief statement of the use you'll make of this review. A discussion is much longer that 3 sentences and should at the very least include an explanation of the significance of the proposed review as well as strengths and limitations of your approach. Please adjust.
The methodology needs adjustments and is missing several details (a reader should be able to reproduce your search and selection process with the protocol):

*Line 146: The search strategy shouldn't be a "draft" but the actual final version.

*Section "exclusion criteria" and "additional file 1":

Table 1/additional file 1 shouldn't be "additional or supplementary" - it is essential information an should be in the protocol manuscript.

Why are you excluding studies published before 2008?

Why have you decided to exclude studies conducted in native individuals, children and individuals with mental disorders? This should be justified in the protocol.

Please explain what the WHO stratum A is.

Are you excluding seniors > 65 years? (not clear). If so, why?

Inconsistency: In the text you mention excluding people with mental disorders, but include individuals with drug addictions? Addiction is a psychological disorder. Also, disabled and homeless people are very likely to suffer from mental health issues. Please explain your inclusion/exclusion choices.

A PRISMA flow diagram should be use to summarize the article screen and selection process.

Sections "data extraction", "data items" and "data analysis": What actual outcome measures will you extract? And how are you planning to present your finding? "Communication strategies" does not tell the reader more than your objective - what actual characteristics of the search strategies are you expecting to find? You should give at least a general idea. Also, the data to be extracted from studies focussing on T2DM will probably be different from those focussing on GDM. How will you separate T2DM and GDM when extracting, reporting and discussing findings?

Section "Risk of bias": Ok for not using a risk of bias assessment tool, however study limitations should be part of your systematic data extraction/assessment process.

Minor and language-related (not extensive) points:

Lines 1-2 (title): Would suggest changing "diabetes type II and gestational diabetes" for "type II and gestational diabetes". Also, please 1) revise the use of "type 2 diabetes" versus "type II diabetes" and 2) change "diabetes mellitus type 2" for "type 2 diabetes mellitus" throughout the text, abstract and title.

Line 74: Remove the word "diabetes" after "type 2".
Line 78: Since it's the start of a new section of the abstract, the word "therefore" should be removed.

Line 79: Change "diabetes type II and gestational diabetes" for "type 2 and gestational diabetes".

Line 90: Please change "diabetes mellitus type 2" for "type 2 diabetes mellitus".

Lines 96 - 97: If you are to use the abbreviations "T2DM" and "GDM", you should add the word "mellitus" in the text too. You could also change abbreviations for "T2D" and "GD".

Line 97: Would suggest replacing semi-colon by "with".

Line 98:
- Would suggest replacing "were" by "being".
- Missing reference at the end of the sentence.
- Missing comma after "Because of its health consequence"
- "The global costs" … of what? I assume it's health-related spendsings, but it is not clear.

Line 101: Missing reference at the end of the sentence.

Line 104: Please change "increasingly" by "increasing".

Line 105: Would suggest replacing "lower socio-economic status" by "economic status".

Line 108:
- Missing reference at end of sentence.
- "… led back to lifestyle factors, which are more common in deprived communities …". Which lifestyle factors are more common in deprived communities exactly?

Line 109: Missing reference at end of sentence.

Line 110: Missing reference at end of sentence.

Lines 111 - 114: This sentence needs to be revised for language and structure.

Line 115: The objectives usually go at the end of the introduction section. There's no need for a "research objective" section, especially only for one sentence/objective.

Line 117: Please change "in the prevention of diabetes mellitus type 2 and gestation diabetes" for "in the prevention of T2DM and GDM".

Lines 120 - 122: It is sufficient to include this information in the "Funding" statement at the end of the manuscript.

Line 123: Change "is established according to PRISMA P" for "was established according to PRISMA-P guidelines".
Lines 127-128: Reference error?

Line 131: Who will translate the articles?

Line 132: "word health organisation" should be "World Health Organisation".

Line 134: Reference error?

Line 135: Missing reference at the end of sentence.

Line 139: The abbreviation "WHO" was never defined before in the text.

Lines 146-147: Is it PudMed or Medline? While 95% of PubMed's articles are also indexed in Medline, those are 2 different databases with different Subject Headings.

Lines 147-201: Would strongly suggesting putting the search strategy in a table.

Lines 204: Would suggest using a software that is specially made for systematic reviews like Covidence.

Lines 210-211: What will be done if no response from corresponding authors?

Lines 231: You're not doing any statistical analyses, the "data analysis" section should be renamed (e.g., data synthesis).
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