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Further comments added dated 22.07.10

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

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.

22.07.10 I still feel this has not been made clear ‘Education for people with diabetes’ rather than ‘diabetes education’ in the title would make this clear

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

22.07.10

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.

This has not been addressed in the changes made

If the first sentence of the Abstract read ‘in relation to educational strategies for people with type 2 diabetes mellitus’ this would be much clearer

Introduction para 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.

22.07.10 It remains unclear how evaluation of education improves the outcomes

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.

22.07.10 There is no acknowledgement that this sample of professionals may not be representative and thus the generalisability of the findings limited

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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.

22.07.10 There are still few references to international papers on this key foundation for this work

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

22.07.10 Now clearer

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!
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.

22.07.10 Better now
d. In Method para 2 I did not understand the meaning of ‘justified’ in the sentence beginning ‘Criteria for selecting…….’
e. In Method the term ‘focal group’ seems to be used interchangeably with ‘focus group’ The latter is the more usual term at least in UK literature.
f. In the sentence beginning ‘In the first meeting…. ‘ on a participation contract’ does not make sense.
g. ‘The researchers occupy one role the research’ is meaningless
h. The meaning of b) the poor integration between professionals and patients’ is not clear to me
i. In Results para 2 does ‘inadequate knowledge’ refer to professionals’ knowledge or patients’?
22.07.10 Largely improved but I am still not clear whose lack of knowledge professional’s or patient’s
j. In Perception about work organisation para 4 does ‘Motivation’ refer to professionals’ or patients’?
22.07.10 This is still not made clear
k. The meaning of sentence ‘The participants indicated that some factors……….. ‘ is unclear. 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.
m. 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?
n. In discussion the sentence ‘In addition , the approach…….’ is very longwinded – the final phrase ‘to grant patients control…’ is much clearer and better
o. Discussion para 2 Whose motivation – patients’ of professionals’?
p. Discussion para 5 Whose capacity for memorization?
q. Discussion para 9 ‘……showing that there is no profess…..’ What does this mean?
r. Reference 4. Evolution or evaluation?
22.07.10 Altered but misspelt
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