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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) Abstract – The abstract and the title are a bit confusing since not all women interviewed had a prior history of GDM and were actually currently pregnant with GDM at the time of the interview. These 8 women should have been excluded because being pregnant with GDM may have many different perspectives than women who had GDM and are currently in the postpartum period. This is important because the main objectives were to identify barriers and facilitators to lifestyle changes postpartum with a major focus on postpartum women.

2) Background – Par. 1, line 2 the incidence of GDM is 3-5% from ref. 1 (from 2006) and on line 7 the incidence is reported as 26-95% from refs. 3-6, these are all from 2004-2005? Are these refs outdated and what is the true incidence of GDM in the US?

3) Is ref. 7 the correct reference for this statement in par. 1?

4) Pg. 4 – line 7-8. Refs. 17-19 examined women with a history of GDM, so what is the difference between these studies and yours? What new information are you adding to this literature?

5) Pg. 4 – If the authors are seeking the perspectives of women with a history of GDM that may be unique to women that had this disease, why did they not have a comparison group of women who did not have the disease in focus groups as well?

6) Pg. 4 – how can retention be predicted? Retention is extremely unpredictable as life happens and may not work out with the best of intentions?

7) Methods – Page 4, For recruitment, women saw posters etc, and contacted the authors, then the authors contacted potential participants to set up an interview at their convenience? Did the authors ask the women when they would be able to participate? If the focus group methodology was too difficult to organize why did the authors not conduct all informant interviews, instead of completely different methodologies (focus vs informant interview)? How comparable are these methods?

8) Methods, pg. 4, Postpartum women that had GDM within the last 7 years are not really postpartum? There are many different aspects of life regarding infant care (postpartum is defined as up to one year post delivery), vs toddler, vs child care vs. school age children. How did the authors account for all of these
different issues in these women’s lives?

9) Methods, pg. 4, How did the authors know that these women did not have type 2 diabetes? Were they screened?

10) Pg. 5, line 2. Did the authors ask the women who could not attend the focus groups why they could not attend? Could this be a part of the barriers and should this important information be captured regarding this population group?

11) Pg. 5 – two different methods – focus group vs informant interview. The informant women did not have the group interaction like the focus group methodology. The informant women received a gift while the focus group received compensation for childcare and transportation costs? The telephone interview lasted 20-45 minutes – how long did the focus groups last? Was the telephone interview audiotaped or digitally recorded as well? What other differences were there between these 2 methods and how did the authors account for these differences? Data analyses also appear to be different? Over the phone is anonymous while in a focus group people are identified?

12) Results – Par. 1 – the numbers do not add up? Out of 38 women, 10 attended the focus groups, which leaves 28 women. Why does Table 2 have 29 women listed? If 18 women completed the interviews, why are 19 listed and what happened to the one woman? Should the data in Table 1 reflect only 28 women?

13) Did the authors try visiting the women at home and providing child care as they did for the focus groups? This may have solved the problem of 6 women participating in the phone interview while caring for their children. The interview setting over the phone appears to have several different factors involved and may have been extremely stressful for these women (while driving?) and also bed rest in hospital (was this one pregnant?) These are compared to a relaxed setting of a focus group where the kids are looked after? Differences between the 2 groups regarding those that have time vs those who do not? What about the age of the children between the 2 groups?

14) Results, pg. 7, par. 2. The 8 women who were currently pregnant should have been excluded as they did not meet your inclusion criteria of history of GDM (this does not mean currently having GDM?) These women’s perspectives would be quite different?

15) Results – Why did the authors only present information regarding the focus groups and not the informant results for “reaction to the diagnosis”? The result section is extremely confusing as the authors jump between focus group information and interview information without cohesion between the themes or results. This should be rewritten. Were the questions different between the groups and that is why there were no consistent themes? What were the themes in the interview group? Can the results be condensed into common themes using two different methods? The results appear to be reporting verbatim what was said without capturing the overall themes?

16) Pg. 14, par. 2, one of the themes that appear in this paragraph is the importance of family. Why was this not captured as a theme?

17) Discussion – pg. 14, first par. With the inclusion criteria of within 7 years after
diagnoses of GDM, the authors cannot claim that the women provided information regarding the year postpartum. Eight of these women were also currently pregnant and again did not fit these criteria.

18) Pg. 16, par. 1, line 9, if 4 out of the 19 women said that they decided to follow the principles of a GDM diet after delivery, how can this be a major theme?

19) Pg. 17, line 2. Again these numbers do not add up?

20) Pg. 17, par. 2, line 1. Focus group or interview participants? It would be interesting to compare the 2 groups with same or different themes emerging from the analyses?

21) There are many confounding factors between the 2 methods that were not accounted or reported.
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