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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

My overall impression is that this study provides potentially useful data on psychological factors which predict the level of control and self-care activities in adolescents with type 1 diabetes and looks at how gender affects these relationships. What was done well is the large number of validated scales which were employed. However, readers without background on some of the scales employed may have a hard time following their reasoning.

A more important concern is that since a very large number of comparisons were made and none appeared to have a p < 0.01 (and several had a p of 0.03 or 0.04), some of these "significant" differences may have occurred by chance. The authors should consider using the Bonferroni correction to highlight those findings which truly reach statistical significance.

Also there should be more detail in the methods as to how HbA1c levels were used in the analysis. For Table 2, were the A1cs based on a single value at the visit closest to when the questionnaires were administered or was there an attempt to average A1cs over the previous year to eliminate some of the visit-to-visit variability.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Use the Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. If possible use A1cs averaged over multiple visits over the past 1-2 years.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

It would help the reader if the authors described what is meant by interceptive impairment (P 5 line 7). Also this sentence was confusing "this construct has been defined in three levels: difficulty of identifying feelings (DIF), difficulty describing feelings (DDF), and externally oriented thinking (EOT); together these dimensions facilitate the management of diabetes". I don't see how DIF and DDF would facilitate as opposed to impair diabetes management and I do not understand what EOT means.

Page 8 line 18: Should make clear that medication usage refers to meds other than insulin

Page 8 line 20: The self care scores and activities are in Table 1, not Table 2.

Tables 2 and 3. In the footnote there is mention of * and ** for p<0.05 and p<0.01 but there are no asterisks in the tables themselves. Were any of the p values <0.01? If so they should be given to 3 decimals.
The discussion and conclusions would be improved by further thoughts on the implications of their findings for managing diabetes in adolescents, i.e. novel strategies for working with difficult patients in poor control.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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