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Reviewer's report:

General
I have with great pleasure read your manuscript and I think it is important to get a deeper understanding how people with type 2 diabetes manage. In conclusion I think you should “work a little bit more” on your article in order to get it easier to follow and understand.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

First of all I would like you to clarify how the ongoing research project is designed. On p 4, second paragraph you write “our study is part of an ongoing research project regarding the autonomy of people with type 2 diabetes…” When I read the current article and make comparisons with your article published in International Journal of Nursing studies no. 43 p417-427 (2006) with the title “Competency in shaping one’s life: Autonomy of people with type 2 diabetes mellitus in a nurse-led, shared-care setting; a qualitative study” I understand that it is the same 15 diabetic patients who have been interviewed. Also I am very curious to read your article in press, your reference no 14 in the current manuscript. Does your article in J Clin Nurs concern the same patients as in the current article as well? I would like to know what you mean by on-going research project, are you going to use your findings for a future intervention study or what?

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1) I think your article would be more clear if you had a sub heading - literature review. As you refer to many different researchers it is sometimes difficult to follow what was applicable for the current article and what refers to other research.

2) The research question could be a bit more distinct; you have written that this research is not about the sufficiency of self-management in terms of outcomes such as well-regulated glycaemia control anyhow some excerpts from the patients deal with this in the result part of the article. p 11. “I do a self monitoring
sugar profile once every 2 weeks”. p11. “I checked my glucose levels yesterday. The glucose profile for that day was quite high”

3) Change the heading result to findings as it is a qualitative study. Use headings and sub headings to make it clearer.

4) In the discussion you should not use the expression evidence as it is a qualitative study.

5) On p 7 line 12 you write elderly type 1 and type 2 diabetic patients who lived in an assisted-housing environment were excluded. Then your write on p 17 line 8 “our participants are elderly people” and in next sentence you write that they usually suffer from more than one chronic condition etc. Should I understand this as you interview elderly type 2 patients not living in nursing homes? You have also written that the oldest person in the study was 77 years old. The youngest person was 55 years old. I then find it difficult to see that you have only elderly participants in your study? How did you know that the participants had a complex health status?

6) In the method part I think you should use subheadings to make the text more clear. It would then be easier to follow what you have done.

7) I think your manuscript would be easier to follow if you had main sub headings in the result part as well. I read your manuscript as if daily activities, off-course and preventive are the main sub headings.

8) You have written p9 3rd line under the results – Table 1 gives an overview of the process steps – consider the word gives

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Table

I think that this table is more to be looked upon as a figure. Also you need to explain more in the table text what it is about.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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