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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Sir,

Please find below our responses to the reviewers and details of how I have addressed their concerns.

Reviewer 1: Garry W John

Major changes:
1. Page 4 and 5 incorrect statistics presented
Response: This has been addressed and the text simplified (in response to reviewer number 2) to ensure clarity.
2. The term diabetic to replaced with people with diabetes.
Response: This has been done throughout where diabetic was used to describe people with diabetes.
3. Sugar to be replaced with glucose throughout.
Response: This has been done throughout the paper.
4. and 5. Discussion to focus on key findings of lack of understanding in workplace and people with diabetes running high blood glucose – to be discussed more fully in discussion and bring out risks to individual and organisation. Discussion section too long and needs to be shorter and more focussed.
Response: The discussion is much shorter and focuses on points identified by reviewer.

Minor corrections
1. Consider reducing number of quotes used
This has been done and only those quotes which convey the important information are now included.
2. Insufficient insulin is central to type 1 diabetes etc.
Response: This is no longer in the paper in response to the second reviewers
Reviewer 2 Ann Van Hecke

Major corrections

1. Background - can assume that potential readers have enough background information on diabetes so definition etc not needed or needs to be shortened.

Response: The journal is a general public health journal not a diabetes specialist journal so it is important to ensure those who do not understand diabetes can understand the context of the findings. However, we have shortened this section.

Line 1-2 page 6 “A facilitative and supportive ....to be effective at work’ – no reference.

Response: a reference for this has been added.

The authors stated that little research has been undertaken in the UK etc but what about research in other countries? If research has already been undertaken in other countries what is relevance to UK.

Response: There is a dearth of research on diabetes in the workplace studies tend to look at the value of workplace health management in general and usually in countries where there is no free health care. Any relevant studies have been included in the paper and a reference to little work done in the UK has been changed to address this issue.

2. Methods

A. Qualitative research approach not specified

Response: On page 6 the approach - Phenomenology has been added.

B. Sample – main inclusion criteria listed in paper – were there others that are relevant to the study.

Response: The word main has been removed to avoid confusion the stated inclusion criteria are correct.

Table 1 – respondents not presented in a coherent and appropriate manner.

Response: Unsure what is incoherent or inappropriate about the table have asked a number of colleagues to give a view and still not sure how to address this comment.

C. Data collection – Unclear what data collection method was used – in depth or semi-structured. Query value of telephone interviews. Were the interview questions modified during process of data collection.

Response: Data was collected using semi-structured interviews and this has been clarified in the paper.

The authors are very experienced in conducting semi-structured interviews over the telephone and were able to obtain the right quality data. The interview schedule was modified – as new themes emerged they were incorporated into the interview guide and addressed in further interviews. This information has been added to the paper.
d. Data analysis – Unclear ‘sufficient respondents were recruited in each
category to achieve data saturation on all elements of the overall study’ please
clarify.
Response: The overall study was about people with diabetes perceptions of
managing their diabetes at work and health service. This has been clarified in the
paper.
No or very limited information is provided on the strategies used to enhance
trustworthiness of data collection and analysis process.
Response: The third member of the research team acted as a ‘peer debriefer’
(Morse and Field, 1987). This has been added to the paper.
Additional information is needed on the reviewer-participant relationship.
Response: Unsure what is meant by this request – who is the reviewer? If this
query relates to the relationship between the researcher being an insider then
this does not apply to our study.
Unclear how researchers used existing literature during the research process
and process of data analysis.
Response: The literature informed all aspects of the study- there is a dearth of
research in this area.
The words themes and categories have different meaning in qualitative research
but have been used interchangeably by authors.
Response: This has been clarified in the methods section and the term themes
has been used throughout.

3. Results – The description of the results is rather superficial. Too many quotes
are used. It would be interesting to expand on the results and use less quotes.
Response: A number of quotes have been removed and further context and
analysis of the data is presented throughout the findings section.

4. Discussion- Authors did not link their results with the literature and only a
summary of results is provided. The link between the research topic on diabetes
and workplace is missing in the first paragraph. The extensive information on
long term complications influencing the individuals ability to do their job
effectively is not relevant.
Response: The discussion has be shortened and re written to accommodate the
views of the first reviewer and to address the above. The link between the
research and the workplace has been strengthened and the information on the
effects of running blood glucose high and the risk of long term complications and
the implications for practice have also been strengthened.

5. Typographical errors and technical issues
Response: Every effort has been made to correct typographical errors.