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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, I found this a very enjoyable read. A lot of thought and work has gone into developing this tool.

Overall, you provide a good rationale, clearly written. I think you could strengthen your argument for the development of this scale greatly by emphasizing gender differences: what are the differences in diabetes and why is it so important to have a separate measure for men? Why can we not use the same measure for women as for men with diabetes?

You've clearly done a lot of hard work in preparing this assessment tool. You should be clearer regarding how you derived the item pool from the literature review as I think this is a little confusing. I think that checking the face validity qualitatively with a separate sample was a really good idea, and using both qualitative and quantitative methods to assess content validity was very well done.

A limitation of the project, as you mention, is that CFA was not performed. Do you have any plans to do this in the future? I think if so, it would be useful to report this or recommend it for other researchers in the field.
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