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Please be advised that all suggestions of referees 1 and 2 were accepted in full, with just presented below.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
It needs to be made clear at the beginning that this paper is about professionals’ role in providing education for patients (not other professionals). Consistent use of a term such as ‘patient education’ would help avoid confusion.

Thus, a group of health professionals working in primary care and the academic community involved in health services practices, when designing their educational process in diabetes, were faced with the need to investigate the existing educational practices in the health service and the results for individual patients. This need raised the demand for reordering the diabetes education program, including each health professional’s skills, the work goals in educational activities, and the evaluation of interventions, in order to establish strategies for health promotion and prevention and control of the disease.

The current study thus proposes to analyze the perceptions, knowledge, and practices of health professionals in primary care related to educational strategies for type 2 diabetes mellitus.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
As stated before both title and abstract need to be made clearer that this paper is about professionals’ views about their role as patient educators in diabetes. At present it could easily be assumed that the paper is in part or whole about professionals’ own or peers’ education about diabetes.

The title- PERCEPTIONS OF PRIMARY HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS TOWARDS DIABETES EDUCATION IN BRAZIL

ABSTRACT

The aim of the current study was to analyze perceptions, knowledge, and practices by primary healthcare professionals in relation to educational strategies for type 2 diabetes mellitus. A total of 23 health professionals working in primary healthcare units in Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais State, Brazil, participated in focus groups in order to discuss their educational practice and the challenges for effective education in diabetes self-management. The results were categorized as follows: 1) lack of preparation and technical knowledge on some aspects of the disease and the health professionals’ educational practices; 2) work conditions and organization; 3) issues related or attributed to the clientele themselves; and 4) diabetes care model. This study highlights the importance of reorienting the educational practices, skills, health professionals’ work goals, and evaluation of the educational interventions, in order to establish strategies for health promotion and prevention and control of the disease.

Minor Essential Revisions

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
I feel that some of the conclusions do not clearly arise from the data presented. In the final sentence of the abstract it is reasonable to
suggest that the data supports changes (though I would say these are principally in the organisation of patient education and the preparation, training and support of those professionals delivering it) but there is little in the data presented to support the call for evaluation of educational strategies.

This study highlights the importance of reorienting the educational practices, skills, health professionals’ work goals, and evaluation of the educational interventions, in order to establish strategies for health promotion and prevention and control of the disease.

Introduction 2-“Furthermore these authors emphasized that if educational programs are evaluated individuals obtain better diagnosis and treatment outcomes.” is a surprising statement and there is nothing in the data shown from this study that confirms the relationship between evaluation of education and patient outcomes.

These same authors emphasize that if educational programs are properly evaluated, the diagnosis and individual treatment compliance tend to improve.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
It is not clear how representative the participants of the study were of professionals working in diabetes patient education – did the mix of professions and their experience and training reflect all those working in this field? This was a small scale study and it is not clear how much the findings relate to local arrangements for diabetes patient education. The authors therefore should be more cautious about the generalisability of this work.

The criterion for selecting the recruitment sites was ease of access due to their link to university services. The health professionals were included in the study because they work with individual and group education in diabetes, had more than two years of experience with
educational practices, and showed experience and interest in diabetes education. The sample thus consisted of 23 health professionals with university training that work in primary care, particularly involved in diabetes care, and that aim to implement a model educational program in diabetes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
There is a huge literature about patient education in diabetes and it is a challenge to be sure that the most relevant papers are referenced. I could see no reference to motivational interviewing which may have strong relevance in health promoting patient education. In ‘Method’ Freire’s theory is mentioned without any explanation or reference.


There are no references for the data analysis methodology used. In discussion the term ‘patient blaming’ is used – there is a considerable literature about this that might be usefully referred to. In Changes to the diabetes care model a reference to support the introductory sentence ‘In the education process…..’ would be appropriate.


Gomes S. Barbosa EF. A técnica de grupos focais para obtenção de dados qualitativos. Belo Horizonte: Instituto de Pesquisa e Inovações Educacionais, 1999.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is largely acceptable. There are however some errors and inconsistencies as well as examples of sentences whose meaning is not clear.

a. Spelling of mellitus in title!

PERCEPTIONS OF PRIMARY HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS TOWARDS DIABETES MELLITUS EDUCATION IN BRAZIL
b. In Method what is meant by ‘non-sensitive topics’?

c. Sentences such as ‘The objective of the focus group was to know the educational practice and factors that act as barriers or facilitators in teaching diabetes self management are very long winded – simpler (e.g. the focus group explored barriers and facilitators for successful patient education in diabetes) is usually better.

The group interviews followed a focus group script with the following themes: educational practices (facilitators and barriers), integration between patients and the health team, essential elements for developing and continuing the educational practice, and proposals for improving the educational programs. Audio recordings were made of the group discussions.

d. In Method 2- I did not understand the meaning of ‘justified’ in the sentence beginning ‘Criteria for selecting…….’

The criterion for selecting the recruitment sites was ease of access due to their link to university services.

i. In Results para 2 does ‘inadequate knowledge’ refer to professionals’ knowledge or patients’?

j. Could this be rewritten in simpler language?

l. Diabetes-related educational practices. The data suggests to me that lack of skills, preparation, time, training and support are all hindering factors here but this is not clearly and simply stated.

**Educational practice in diabetes**

In this category, participants emphasized the limited involvement by professionals in educational practice, resulting in repetitive and mechanical work and the lack of an interdisciplinary approach. The professionals felt the need to interact more with individual patients and participate in the groups with other colleagues, jointly discussing what can be done to improve daily educational practice. Some admit
that they are not concerned about how they should conduct the groups and educational practices.

**E8:** [...] *we don’t educate the clientele very well, and this limited education doesn’t help with diabetes prevention and control [...] it’s important for the health professional to become active and involved in the educational practice [...] to be available and take interest in teamwork."

**E2:** "[...] I’ve tried to improve the patients’ blood glucose levels [...] but we haven’t achieved the objectives of educational work [...] The professionals’ effort is very limited, and they need to share [the work] with other professionals."

Quote E10 does not seem to relate to the statement above it. Does ‘integration’ refer to communication? I was not clear about what ‘not concerned’ meant. Does it refer to lack of concern / worry or lack of current involvement?

**E10:** "The groups lack participation by all the professionals. Few lead the groups [...] while individual patients demand participation by other professionals [...] and this situation hinders the educational practice."

n. In discussion the sentence ‘In addition , the approach.......’ is very longwinded– the final phrase ‘to grant patients control...’ is much clearer and better.

The current educational process is based on health professionals “transferring” information on diabetes (the disease), rather than a more comprehensive and effective educational approach. The approach should focus on the need to establish a dialogue and thus on the capacity to hear the needs and demands of the groups with whom one is working. The target of the process should also be knowledge on living and work conditions and life habits and lifestyles, which would tend to shape education focused on self-management,
i.e., training individuals for self-control over the determinants of their health \[6,11\].

The health professionals’ discourse suggests that they are blaming the victims, i.e., incriminating the patients for their own disease. The professionals thus tend to reproduce a restricted and normative view and practice in relation to the health/disease process. Meanwhile, their discourse indicates discomfort towards such practices and a perception of their own limited effectiveness.

The health professionals’ discourse suggests that they are blaming the victims, i.e., incriminating the patients for their own disease. The professionals thus tend to reproduce a restricted and normative view and practice in relation to the health/disease process. Meanwhile, their discourse indicates discomfort towards such practices and a perception of their own limited effectiveness.

o. Discussion para 2 Whose motivation – patients’ of professionals’?

The health professionals’ point of view relates to activities that have been implemented within inadequate structures (hasty consultations with symbolic configurations and specific power relations) through individual or group initiatives that have produced little progress. They emphasize that the lack of time, motivation, financial incentives, and didactic materials and individual patient passiveness towards treatment limit the effectiveness of educational practice and the implementation of an educational program in primary care and daily patient education \[9,10\].

p. Discussion para 5 Whose capacity for memorization?

Patients are rarely in a position to build knowledge whereby they can ask about the treatment or their own experiences, comparing, analyzing, or verbalizing their day-to-day knowledge about health education.

r. Reference 5. Evolution or evaluation?

Discretionary Revisions

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
3. Are the data sound?

Qualitative method with focus groups is an appropriate way of exploring this topic. However there is little detail of how the data was analysed, were the categories determined in advance or did they arise from the themes found in the
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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors present an interesting and potentially important piece of research.

Unfortunately, the Introduction, the Method, and the Discussion sections require a significant amount of editing and rewriting. From the cover letter, the manuscript appears to have been previously reviewed. I am uncertain why the first review did not address the grammatical and wording mistakes in these sections or, if they did, why the authors choose to ignore them. While there are too many to list, I will provide examples.
In the Introduction’s first paragraph the authors state “Educational programs and strategies can change behavior by improving metabolism control and self-monitoring of skills so the diabetic patient can make treatment decisions.” This is a difficult sentence to follow and understand, and the phrase “self-monitoring of skills” unclear.

**Educational programs and strategies can contribute to behavior change and improve metabolic control and self-monitoring of skills for the individual diabetic to make treatment decisions** [2-4]. Diabetes education is a therapeutic approach that motivates individuals to acquire knowledge and develop skills that facilitate self-management of care [2].

Similar issues are also found in the Methods section. I do not know how to interpret the phrases “23 health professionals with superior education” (page 3, 3rd paragraph) or “The researchers occupy one role the research” (page 4 3rd paragraph). Also, the correct term is “focus group” not “focal group.”

**The sample thus consisted of 23 health professionals with university training that work in primary care, particularly involved in diabetes care, and that aim to implement a model educational program in diabetes.**

The data were collected using the focus group technique and filling out an identification form for health professionals using specific instruments. The data were collected using the focus group technique and filling out an identification form for health professionals using specific instruments.

**The focus group meetings included 10 to 12 participants, i.e., a kind of interview or conversation in homogeneous groups, designed to obtain information on a specific theme** [9,10].
The Discussion section also has hard to understand passages. For example, on page 11 first paragraph the authors write “This includes extending an attitude of listening and...” and down further in the third paragraph “…showing that there is no profess in these activities.”

They emphasize that the lack of time, motivation, financial incentives, and didactic materials and individual patient passiveness towards treatment limit the effectiveness of educational practice and the implementation of an educational program in primary care and daily patient education[9,10].

The health professionals’ discourse suggests that they are blaming the victims, i.e., incriminating the patients for their own disease. The professionals thus tend to reproduce a restricted and normative view and practice in relation to the health/disease process. Meanwhile, their discourse indicates discomfort towards such practices and a perception of their own limited effectiveness.

Curiously, the Results section is well-organized, clearly written with interesting findings. However, an appropriate review of the manuscript cannot be completed until the material is more clearly written. I suggest the authors seek the assistance of a science editor or writer for this task.
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PERCEPTIONS OF PRIMARY HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS TOWARDS DIABETES MELLITUS EDUCATION IN BRAZIL

ABSTRACT

The aim of the current study was to analyze perceptions, knowledge, and practices by primary healthcare professionals in relation to educational strategies for type 2 diabetes mellitus. A total of 23 health professionals working in primary healthcare units in Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais State, Brazil, participated in focus groups in order to discuss their educational practice and the challenges for effective education in diabetes self-management. The results were categorized as follows: 1) lack of preparation and technical knowledge on some aspects of the disease and the health professionals’ educational practices; 2) work conditions and organization; 3) issues related or attributed to the clientele themselves; and 4) diabetes care model. This study highlights the importance of reorienting the educational practices, skills, health professionals’ work goals, and evaluation of the educational
interventions, in order to establish strategies for health promotion and prevention and control of the disease.

**Descriptors:** Health Education; Prevention of Diabetes Mellitus; Primary Healthcare.

---

**INTRODUCTION**

The incidence and prevalence of type 2 diabetes mellitus are increasing in epidemic proportions and impacting the 30 to 69-year age bracket \(^1\). The increasing morbidity and mortality in this population group and the complexity of diabetes treatment, including dietary restrictions, use of medication, and associated chronic complications (retinopathy, nephropathy, neuropathy, cardiopathy, neuropathic foot, and others) emphasize the need for effective educational programs and training for health professionals, in order for them to meet this demand adequately. This is one of the current challenges for public health, especially in primary care. Educational programs and strategies can contribute to behavior change and improve metabolic control and self-monitoring of skills for the individual diabetic to make treatment decisions \(^2\text{-}^4\). Diabetes education is a therapeutic approach that motivates individuals to acquire knowledge and develop skills that facilitate self-management of care \(^2\).
Several authors \cite{5,6} have added that to achieve effective diabetes education requires providing health professionals with training, current knowledge on the disease, pedagogical skills, effective communication, listening, and understanding, as well as the capacity to negotiate with individual patients and use dynamic and interactive strategies to reduce the barriers to quality individual care. These same authors emphasize that if educational programs are properly evaluated, the diagnosis and individual treatment compliance tend to improve.

Current efforts to improve the quality diabetes care are based on knowledge of factors associated with the health professionals, including the limitation of their knowledge and skills concerning the disease, organization of their educational practices, and quality of provider-patient interaction based on cultural, social, and cognitive understanding and language. Several studies\cite{7,8} have suggested that such factors act as barriers or facilitators for implementing education in self-care and that they affect the choice of individual patient’s treatment choices. However, relatively few studies have been performed to identify these factors.

Thus, a group of health professionals working in primary care and the academic community involved in health services practices, when designing their educational process in diabetes, were faced with the need to investigate the existing educational practices in the health service and the results for individual patients. This need raised the demand for reordering the diabetes education program, including each health professional’s skills, the work goals in educational activities, and the evaluation of interventions, in order to establish strategies for health promotion and prevention and control of the disease.

The current study thus proposes to analyze the perceptions, knowledge, and practices of health professionals in primary care related to educational strategies for type 2 diabetes mellitus.

METHOD
The research was designed as a case study with a descriptive/exploratory qualitative approach. The study was developed and conducted in two primary care units on the East Side of Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais State, Brazil, from April to June 2009. The criterion for selecting the recruitment sites was ease of access due to their link to university services. The health professionals were included in the study because they work with individual and group education in diabetes, had more than two years of experience with educational practices, and showed experience and interest in diabetes education. The sample thus consisted of 23 health professionals with university training that work in primary care, particularly involved in diabetes care, and that aim to implement a model educational program in diabetes.

The data were collected using the focus group technique and filling out an identification form for health professionals using specific instruments. The focus group meetings included 10 to 12 participants, i.e., a kind of interview or conversation in homogeneous groups, designed to obtain information on a specific theme \[^9,10\]. The aim of the focus group was to learn about the educational practices and the factors that hinder or facilitate education in diabetes self-management. The identification form provided a description of the participants, including: gender, age, schooling, profession, time on the job, and experience with individual and group educational practices in diabetes.

The participating health professionals worked in the fields of nutrition, physical therapy, medicine, and nursing. Their time on the job ranged from 9 to 28 years, and they were all women with experience working with group and individual diabetes education.

Two focus group meetings were held in each primary care unit, lasting one hour each and involving an average of 10 to 12 health professionals, totaling four meetings.

The group interviews followed a focus group script with the following themes: educational practices (facilitators and barriers), integration between patients and the health team, essential elements for developing
and continuing the educational practice, and proposals for improving the educational programs. Audio recordings were made of the group discussions.

To ensure the participants’ anonymity, the interviews were numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, ..., 10.

The material was recorded, systematized, and categorized to build a database, considering recurrent and frequently expressed opinions, disagreements, and consensuses. The principal category emerging from analysis of the material relates to difficulties and barriers experienced by the professionals to perform more effective work. Within this category we created subcategories in which we grouped the answers related to: 1) work conditions; 2) work organization; 3) lack of the professionals’ technical preparedness in relation to diabetes; 4) issues related to the individual patient conditions; and 5) issues related to the educational practice itself. This last set of factors was the central object of our analyses, including discussion of: a) the professionals’ involvement in the educational practice; b) limited provider-patient integration; c) reduction of the debate on diabetes to test results and prescription changes; and d) issues pertaining to participatory methods.

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Federal University in Minas Gerais (UFMG) and the Belo Horizonte Municipal Health Secretariat, having complied with all the requirements of Ruling 196/96, of the Brazilian National Health Council.

RESULTS

The findings were grouped according to aspects highlighted by primary healthcare professionals. In the discussions, all the professionals reported the "difficulties and barriers” in dealing with daily situations related to group educational strategies for more effective work with diabetes.

Our analysis showed that from the health professionals’ point of view, the principal barrier to the effectiveness of diabetes care was inadequate
knowledge on how to manage diabetes and group education, as reflected in the following quotes:

**Lack of knowledge on diabetes among the health professionals**

The professionals reported that they feel insufficiently prepared to conduct educational practices, pointing to limited knowledge concerning the disease, the importance of diabetes management, and pedagogical methodologies as aspects that hinder more effective results in education for diabetes self-management.

**E1:** “I feel poorly prepared in relation to educational dynamics, teaching techniques [...] I don’t feel trained for health education or developing knowledge on the disease”

Another aspect frequently identified in the discussion relates to the health professionals’ perception of the work conditions in which primary care is provided.

**Perception of Work Conditions**

Low wages, limited physical space for educational activities, and limited access to the health center’s coverage area are perceived by the health professionals as factors that affect the diabetes educational practice. They reported the need to establish partnerships to use other places such as churches, homes for the elderly, and neighborhood associations in order to ensure comfortable areas with the necessary privacy for the educational activities.

**E3:** “The physical space is very limited [...] there’s no way to conduct the educational activities [...] the coverage area is huge, and for some patients it’s hard to make it to the health center and participate in the groups.”

In the discussions, the participants remarked on the scarcity of educational materials, lack of structure in the educational process, and lack of recognition of the groups’ importance in education for self-care.

**Perceptions of the work organization**
Some professionals pointed to the absence of a clear proposal in the diabetes care service and remarked on the lack of time, the work overload, and lack of planning in the group activities.

**E4:** "The groups are large, involving talks with too many people, it’s very difficult to orient so many people all together [...] with meetings once a week [...] the group becomes tiresome, repetitive, unproductive, uninteresting, always the same people [...] the group doesn’t have a start or finish."

Thus, the problems detected by the majority of the health professionals refer to the services’ organizational structure: lack of time and availability to participate in the groups due to the large number of individual patient consultations and the lack of training and motivation for conducting groups.

Motivation was considered an important factor, according to quotes from the participants, and appeared more frequently among physicians and nurses that participated in educational activities. Motivation was viewed as a catch-all term encompassing issues related to professional interests, intentions, and awareness.

The participants identified several patient-related factors that impact the continuity of diabetes education activities.

**Conditions of individuals with type 2 diabetes**

The discussions revealed the difficulties in adhering to education for self-care, and some health professionals confirmed that economic, cultural, and social factors affect individual attitudes in diabetes self-management. The barriers identified by health professionals in relation to individual patients included lack of time to adhere to healthy life habits, lack of money, absence of appropriate places for physical exercise, and individual passivity towards treatment.

Problems in provider-patient communication included health professionals’ lack of understanding of the social context, inattention to specific knowledge, language differences, and insufficient consultation
time for patients to be heard and express their doubts, knowledge, and difficulties in understanding medical terms. The information is thus not effective for patients to decide and take an active part in the treatment. Meanwhile, health professionals’ role in routine diabetes education is predominantly paternalistic.

**E6:** “Sometimes the issue of language, attitude [...] and the inability to construct knowledge together with the population [mean that] some professionals feel unprepared for [diabetes] education and lack the skills to recognize their own limits.”

The health professionals reported that it is important to improve individual patient education by working on cultural and social issues and developing reflexive listening to foster education in self-care and help patients realize that their actions make the difference in diabetes treatment.

**Educational practice in diabetes**

In this category, participants emphasized the limited involvement by professionals in educational practice, resulting in repetitive and mechanical work and the lack of an interdisciplinary approach. The professionals felt the need to interact more with individual patients and participate in the groups with other colleagues, jointly discussing what can be done to improve daily educational practice. Some admit that they are not concerned about how they should conduct the groups and educational practices.

**E8:** “ [...] we don’t educate the clientele very well, and this limited education doesn’t help with diabetes prevention and control [...] it’s important for the health professional to become active and involved in the educational practice [...] to be available and take interest in teamwork.”

**E2:** “[...] I’ve tried to improve the patients’ blood glucose levels [...] but we haven’t achieved the objectives of educational work [...] The professionals’ effort is very limited, and they need to share [the work] with other professionals.”
The health professionals commented on the importance of receiving training in health education for self-care, defining their skills and tasks within the team in order achieve decentralization from the physician/nurse figure in diabetes care and seek an interdisciplinary approach in developing a model educational program.

According to the participants’ discourse, the second greatest difficulty in education was the limited integration between the health professionals and diabetics, based on cultural, social, cognitive, and linguistic comprehension.

**E10**: “The groups lack participation by all the professionals. Few lead the groups [...] while individual patients demand participation by other professionals [...] and this situation hinders the educational practice.”

Additionally, the health professionals interviewed here were not concerned about the cognitive, motivational, and emotional barriers in the provider-patient relationship that interfere in self-care and self-management of the illness.

The participants highlighted the importance of involving the team in the educational practice, and individual health workers should know their competency and the limits of their scope of work. According to the health professionals, the group debates focus only on test results and changing prescriptions, with poor use of the space for dialogue, which becomes “tiresome and boring”, a frequently reported difficulty in educational practice, as illustrated below.

**E7**: “the group focuses mainly on changing prescriptions, obtaining the medication, and having the physician check the test results [...] and discuss the difficulty in understanding the prescription, which is sometimes long and drawn out, [...] all of which becomes tiresome and boring for the health professionals.”

The participants also recognize that the health professionals and patients should collaborate to develop participatory strategies in order to improve the odds of managing the disease and reduce the physical,
psychological, social, and economic consequences of diabetes, as described next.

**Change in the Diabetes Care Model**

In the educational process, health professionals should include planning activities that promote group work in shared knowledge-building. The professionals interviewed here acknowledged the need to improve diabetes care, as described in the following interview:

**E8:** "Groups discussions with patients should be based on the population’s needs with the objective of obtaining more and interested spontaneous individual participation. Thus, the educational process becomes more effective if it is based on the community’s wishes and needs."

**E9:** “When working in groups involving professionals with different knowledge sets, you can’t bring a pre-formatted approach for the individual patients. It has to be something that the population suggests, based on their needs, to exchange knowledge. The team’s involvement is important, each professional need to be aware of the competencies and limits of their coworkers from other professions.”

The health professionals also mentioned the importance of assessing the patients’ economic situation in order to orient their eating plan and reinforce the provider-patient contact, communication between the various persons involved in the process, the language used by the health professional, and the space for discussing and elaborating didactic materials to be used in practice. They highlighted that patients should be well informed about their illness in order to achieve effective treatment results and know how to manage the care and obtain control of the treatment.

**DISCUSSION**

The current educational process is based on health professionals “transferring” information on diabetes (the disease), rather than a more comprehensive and effective educational approach. The approach should
focus on the need to establish a dialogue and thus on the capacity to hear the needs and demands of the groups with whom one is working. The target of the process should also be knowledge on living and work conditions and life habits and lifestyles, which would tend to shape education focused on self-management, i.e., training individuals for self-control over the determinants of their health \[6,11\].

The health professionals’ point of view relates to activities that have been implemented within inadequate structures (hasty consultations with symbolic configurations and specific power relations) through individual or group initiatives that have produced little progress. They emphasize that the lack of time, motivation, financial incentives, and didactic materials and individual patient passiveness towards treatment limit the effectiveness of educational practice and the implementation of an educational program in primary care and daily patient education \[9,10\].

The health professionals’ discourse suggests that they are blaming the victims, i.e., incriminating the patients for their own disease. The professionals thus tend to reproduce a restricted and normative view and practice in relation to the health/disease process. Meanwhile, their discourse indicates discomfort towards such practices and a perception of their own limited effectiveness.

The study’s results indicate that the health professionals are aware and want to modify their behavior towards educational practices and complain of a lack of training for such change, specifically in relation to diabetes education. Some authors\[3,11\] emphasize that any intervention to improve health services should train the health team in a constant effort to improve the social relations appearing in the services’ daily activity, from a critical and reflexive perspective towards the work process. Thus, in addition to the basic investment in health work conditions and organization, it is clearly necessary to invest in training health professionals in primary care and education, in close collaboration with researchers, leading to innovative products for the services and relevant new challenges for the academic community.
The findings in the literature\textsuperscript{[12,13]} indicate that the level of knowledge required by diabetics is associated with health professionals’ ability to listen and their recall capacity, managed according to formal principles such as “the doctor asks and the patient replies”. Patients are rarely in a position to build knowledge whereby they can ask about the treatment or their own experiences, comparing, analyzing, or verbalizing their day-to-day knowledge about health education.

Additionally, several authors\textsuperscript{[16,18]} state that diabetic patients report satisfaction in the interaction of forms of knowledge built through exchange of experiences and knowledge between the health team and themselves. Appreciation of the social issues and setting is crucial for diabetes treatment and educational practices\textsuperscript{[12-14]}. It is thus necessary to reinforce a perspective that discusses the social determinants of health. Consistently, it is necessary to expand knowledge and practices to deal with these social determinants in primary care services, through more reflexive health promotion strategies and programs and educational practices.

The challenge is to expand an attitude of listening to and considering the relevance of diabetic patients’ experiences and perceptions and asking them what they need in order to improve their self-care. The task of health professionals during the educational process for patient self-care involves evaluating and understanding individual patients, providing them with emotional and clinical support and knowledge and skills to achieve the treatment objectives, helping them discover and develop autonomy to deal better with their illness\textsuperscript{[11,15]}.

The study’s information pertains only to health professionals with the aim of implementing an educational model for diabetes within the primary care setting. The findings are consistent with the literature in relation to difficulties with diabetes education\textsuperscript{[15-18]}.

In summary, health professionals need to reflect on educational practices and how they are constructed in the field of education and health. Current educational strategies are not favoring self-care and
patient control of the disease, and there is a lack of progress in these activities. Health professionals should seek to develop health education skills and admit the difficulties, limitations, and slow and gradual nature of the learning process in order to obtain the “results” that allow improving educational practice in diabetes.

The suggested improvements for achieving a systematized educational process include updating the health professionals’ knowledge, combining aspects from education and health promotion in order to incorporate professionals that are capable of reflecting on and intervening in their educational actions, with individual patients as their partners in reorienting the educational practice. Such health work organization aims to assign responsibility to primary care managers, who should seek to induce, plan, and encourage the adoption of more comprehensive educational strategies and practices, provide better training for the health team, work with an evaluative perspective toward their practices to make education an important therapeutic tool in health professionals’ practice, and help them improve the work methodology and information for self-management of diabetes care.

**FINAL REMARKS**

Participation in the focus group provided the health professionals with the opportunity to reflect on the educational process and the difficulties in establishing and maintaining the practice due to the lack of learning related to work in the field of health education, a gap that persists from their original training to the present in their work as professionals. This gap appears in the educational program, where the absence of organization and planning in the educational practice jeopardizes the quality of individual patient care.

We observed that the focus group results allowed health professionals to assume their role as educational protagonists, producing emancipative knowledge, encouraging reflection and the capacity for critical analysis, including educational practice in diabetes as one of the determinants of
learning self-care, in the search to provide individual patients with therapeutic education for self-management of the illness.
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