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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for sending me the article "Probiotics for glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: protocol for a systematic review" for peer review.

The authors make a great effort to justify their SR-MA, given the existence of recent SR, but emphasize the appearance of new clinical trials in recent years, and also interestingly add the comparison of the time of treatment with probiotics (long and short time).

The protocol for the SR is very well written. It is noted that the authors have experience in the development of this research methodology. I believe that the form of presentation of the condition and intervention are clear for what they are looking for.

The objective is clear and coherent.

I am concerned with the outcomes used in Health services outcomes: are you sure you have data from the clinical trials to extract this information? I recommend reviewing and considering them only if the information is feasible.

The methodology to develop the search is clear and includes a broad search in the main databases and they hope to access clinical trial records and references of the identified articles.

The assessment of the risk of bias with the Cochrane tool is clear. In addition, they innovate with the use of Covidence as a suitable software to use in SR.

It is fantastic how they propose the evaluation of bias reporting, I ask you please include it clearly in the article. Almost that in a separate table where they show the reader their findings. It is likely that some of the articles do not even have records of their protocols. In case of identifying them, this should also be mentioned.
I recommend improving the description of quality assessment with the GRADE tool, it is important to mention the domains of evaluation and the possible results of it.

They adequately propose the evaluation of clinical and statistical heterogeneity; the justification of the MA and the sensitivity analyzes.

I'm not sure if they overlooked it and did not want to annex it, but I cannot find the discussion of the article. Strongly recommending the inclusion of the discussion. It is a fundamental section for a publication. Also, in diabetes mellitus, it is necessary to mention the implications that the results may have. What has happened to the results of the other SRs published? has clinical practice varied with the results of these MA? In short, they have a large number of topics around the use of probiotics in type 2 diabetes that can be approached to the fullest in the discussion section.

In conclusion, the article is very well conceived and written. However, as a reviewer I consider that it is necessary to include a discussion section to be accepted. For that reason my response to the editor is a major revision.
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