

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Do type 2 diabetes mellitus patients included in randomised clinical trials differ from general-practice patients? A cross-sectional comparative study.
AUTHORS	DUGARD, Amandine; Giraudeau, Bruno; Dibao-Dina, Clarisse

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Badariah Ahmad Monash University, School of Medicine and Health Sciences
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Oct-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	Well-written. Results highlighted and justification given for the gaps to question. The topic of the research paper is relevant and raised an awareness regarding application of clinical trials results from the normal population.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Nicholas Wright Royal New Zealand College of General Practitioners
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Oct-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an excellent topic for the article, very good generally</p> <p>Writing needs major work, but the structure is there, and the work seems logical and well done</p> <p>Writing is passive at times - please correct</p> <p>Some very significant grammatical issues please review</p> <p>P2 L 27 - 0.1 - units? Standard deviation? You've said in the line before standardised difference - do you mean standard deviation? (This is used throughout the piece, please correct) L54 applicability - perhaps better worded as generalisability?</p> <p>P5 L 25 - doesn't read well L41 - explain the exclusions a bit better please?</p> <p>P6 L21 Can just say Feb - May don't need overly specific dataes L 38 data collected: gender - or sex? If gender is this self identified?</p> <p>Don't need to specify the researcher in the paper, just say data collected by investigator, and then in the contributions section at the end of the article you can say who did what</p> <p>table one spelling error</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>P8 L50 two each were written in Russian and chinese? or one in each of the languages. Is it correct to call it Chinese rather than mandarin or kantonese?</p> <p>P9 L14 mean+/-SD needs spacing / formatting. Pick if you are using 1 or 2 decimal places, it doesn't really add much to the article to have the second decimal point and decreases legability, so I'd only include if needed</p> <p>P10 L21 some lines like this are really repetitive</p> <p>L35 limitations rather than limits</p> <p>L 41 For example, for the cardiovascular risk factors, it has been show that cardiovascular risk in type II diabetes don't repeat cardiovascular risk twice in a sentence L44 onwards I kind of understand what you're saying but needs to be reworded - next few sentences</p> <p>P17 The graphs are interesting but took me a bit to figure out - it's not the standard deviation of the item on the left, it's the comparison between groups. The graphs could do with a better key or title - we are looking at the differences between populations - and the standard deviation is calculated comparing these two populations - it would be nice to have some small line here explaining how you've calculated this so the graph can be used as a standalone image.</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Badariah Ahmad, Monash University

Comments to the Author:

Well-written. Results highlighted and justification given for the gaps to question. The topic of the research paper is relevant and raised an awareness regarding application of clinical trials results from the normal population.

We thank the reviewer 1 for those kind comments.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Nicholas Wright, Royal New Zealand College of General Practitioners

Comments to the Author:

This is an excellent topic for the article, very good generally

Writing needs major work, but the structure is there, and the work seems logical and well done

Writing is passive at times - please correct

Some very significant grammatical issues please review

We thank the reviewer for these comments. We made corrections throughout the manuscript.

P2

L 27 - 0.1 - units? Standard deviation? You've said in the line before standardised difference - do you mean standard deviation? (This is used throughout the piece, please correct)

We specified that 0.1 actually corresponds to 0.1 standard deviation (meaning a difference in means of more than 0.1 standard deviation). Such precision was added and the *Statistical analysis* section.

L54 applicability - perhaps better worded as generalisability?

We made the change.

P5

L 25 - doesn't read well

L41 - explain the exclusions a bit better please?

We made corrections throughout the page.

P6

L21 Can just say Feb - May don't need overly specific dataes

We made the change.

L 38 data collected: gender - or sex? If gender is this self identified?

It was sex as confirmed by the general practitioner when AD collected the data by asking them the question. We made the change.

Don't need to specify the researcher in the paper, just say data collected by investigator, and then in the contributions section at the end of the article you can say who did what

We made the change.

table one spelling error

We made the correction.

P8

L50 two each were written in Russian and chinese? or one in each of the languages. Is it correct to call it Chinese rather than mandarin or kantonese?

We corrected as followed: *"Two reports were unavailable, one was written in Russian and another in Chinese..."* We ignore if the language was either mandarin or kantonese.

P9

L14 mean+/-SD needs spacing / formatting.

Pick if you are using 1 or 2 decimal places, it doesn't really add much to the article to have the second decimal point and decreases legability, so I'd only include if needed

We made the change.

P10

L21 some lines like this are really repetitive

We made corrections throughout this page.

L35 limitations rather than limits

We made the change

L 41 For example, for the cardiovascular risk factors, it has been show that cardiovascular risk in type II diabetes

don't repeat cardiovascular risk twice in a sentence

We made the change.

L44 onwards I kind of understand what you're saying but needs to be reworded - next few sentences

We made the corrections.

P17

The graphs are interesting but took me a bit to figure out - it's not the standard deviation of the item on the left, it's the comparison between groups. The graphs could do with a better key or title - we are looking at the differences between populations - and the standard deviation is calculated comparing these two populations - it would be nice to have some small line here explaining how you've calculated this so the graph can be used as a standalone image.

We added the precisions in the Figure.