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Title: Perceptions on hypertension among migrants in Delhi, India: a qualitative study

Version: 3 Date: 12 March 2009

Reviewer: Deborah J Cohen

Reviewer's comments and author’s responses:

This is an interesting manuscript that has been improved by the authors following the first review. In my opinion this manuscript is still longer (over 5000) then it needs to be and could easily be cut by 1500 words, and would be more concise if it were. Beyond that, I would not make any further recommendations to the authors.

I agree with Prof. Cohen that the manuscript is longer. And I have tried to reduce it as far as possible. However, the length is not reduced considerably as some of text was added during current revision.

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.
Declaration of competing interests: I have no competing interests.
# 2

**Title:** Perceptions on hypertension among migrants in Delhi, India: a qualitative study

**Version:** 4  **Date:** 12 June 2009

**Reviewer:** Deborah J Cohen

**Reviewer's comments and author's responses:**
I have reviewed the points made by the other reviewer and based on the author’s response I think 3 c and d are fine and are adequately addressed.
On the issue of saturation, I think this manuscript is fine and the reviewer’s question/comment has been addressed.
On the issue of theory, I don’t think the reviewer’s comment has been addressed. Kleinman’s work on explanatory models is not a theory. I think this is a fixable problem. I would suggest the authors consider writing something like the following: “This project used a grounded theory approach to develop an understanding of and theory about how disadvantaged settled and neo-migrants in India view hypertension.” This is essentially what they have done. They should consider citing Glaser and Strauss on grounded theory, and can keep their citations and point about Klienman. They are still relevant.

As suggested, it was mentioned that the project used a grounded theory approach and appropriate references were given in the revised manuscript. Citations about Klienman’s EMs were retained as such.
Title: Perceptions on hypertension among migrants in Delhi, India: a qualitative study

Version: 3 Date: 7 January 2009

Reviewer: Christiana Noestlinger

Reviewer’s comments and author’s responses:

In what is to follow, I refer to my previous review and will provide answers assessing in how far the points raised were taken care of.

1) Research question
Page 3: The purpose of the paper is now presented in a more focused way in the introduction. However, I would still propose to make the objectives more visible by adding one sentence like: ‘the aim of this study was to explore explanatory models of hypertension held by…’ (at the end of the paragraph on background…’
The objective is made more clear by adding the proposed sentence, as suggested.

I would suggest to use another term (e.g. ‘demographic context’) rather than ‘the People’ as heading for the next section…
As suggested, the term ‘Demographic Context’ was used in place of ‘The People’

2) Method section
The method section has clearly improved, but the confusion between methodological approach and data collection technique is still inherent in the text. A statement on the underlying methodology is clearly missing (ethnographic study, grounded theory approach, etc.). As the authors did not comment on this remark, it seems obvious that no decision for one specific methodological approach was taken when designing the study, so the authors may want to start out by saying something like for instance ‘this study is based on a qualitative inductive approach using data collected through both in-depth interviews and FGD…’.
For the present study, grounded theory approach was adopted. In the revised manuscript, it was mentioned that ‘This study used a grounded approach to develop an understanding …….. The same has also been suggested by the first reviewer.

The rationale given for the use of the two different data collection techniques is sufficiently explanatory, but unfortunately in the text no further use is made of the two different types of data sources. (# see also remarks on results).
I agree with reviewer’s comment. Since there is convergence of issues in both types of data it was decided to present the results together. However, the issues that occurred more specifically during in-depth interviews and FGDs were mentioned clearly in the revised manuscript.
Page 5: refer to table 2 and talk about composition of FGD
The given suggestion was taken care of and a brief description of the table is given in the revised manuscript.

The authors should talk about “saturation of data” rather than “redundancy”; Changes were made in the revised manuscript, as suggested.

The authors address purposive sampling for FGDs; this needs some more explanation, not just a catchword… An explanation on sampling procedure is briefly given in the revised manuscript.

The fact that the author/researcher moderated the discussion could be seen as a limitation to the study (introducing a bias when steering the discussion in a specific direction, even without intention or not on purpose …) As suggested, this is included as a limitation of the study in the revised manuscript.

Page 6: Structure this part of the method section according to in-depth interviews and FGDs as this will result in better readability.
As suggested, methods section was presented separately according to in-depth interviews and FGDs. However, no specific sub-headings were given for in-depth interviews and FGDs.

Mention if topic guides were pre-tested or piloted.
Topic guides were pre-tested and this was corrected in the revised manuscript.

Mention clearly on which type of data or health behavior model the development of the topic guides was based on.
The topic guides for In-depth interviews as well as FGDs were based on some earlier studies and Kleinman’s EMs. Primarily it was decided to explore Kleinman’s EMs and the same was mentioned in the revised manuscript under study instruments.

Though the data captured some health beliefs such as perceived susceptibility, seriousness, self-efficacy, etc., no particular health behavioural theory (eg. Health Belief Model) was mentioned. This is purely because; no specific behavioural theory was consulted during the development of topic guide.

A lot of new information was added to the method section, which provides necessary background information about how the study was done. However, this new text could be structured a bit more. I propose to have subheadings, like study participants, study instruments, procedures…etc.
As suggested, methods section is presented under the proposed sub headings. Also the details pertaining to in-depth interviews and focus group discussions were provided in separate paragraphs (with out further sub-sub headings) under each sub heading.

Coding and analysis:
Describe clearly the role of the independent research (# page 7: ‘another
anthropologist’): were the coding made by two independent researchers or was it just some kind of feedback?
The data were coded only by the author herself. The role of anthropologist was limited to reading the data independently and giving the feedback. This is mentioned in the revised manuscript.

Limitations of the study: I suggest to put this whole section towards the end, before the discussion section. Add the potential bias that may result from the fact that the researcher was also the moderator…
The given suggestions were taken care of. This part is placed at the beginning of the discussion. I agree with the reviewer that bias may result due to involvement of researcher as moderator. This limitation was also mentioned under limitations in the revised manuscript.

3) Results
As indicated under “methods”, the added value of the different types of data used is lost. It would be interesting to learn more about which type of data yielded which type of results, as indicated in the method section.
I agree with reviewer’s comment. It was because of the fact that there is convergence of issues in both types of data and hence it was decided to present the results together. However, the issues that occurred more specifically during in-depth interviews and FGDs were mentioned towards the end of the results, in the revised manuscript.

Indicate gender and age in a consistent manner when quoting a study participant.
As suggested, it was followed during the revision and given consistently in the revised manuscript.

# Page 8:
Explain abbreviation BP.
Abbreviation for BP is provided in parenthesis as it appeared first in the text.

Use the term “quotes” instead of “verbatim”
As suggested, the abbreviation is given. The term ‘quotes’ was used in stead of ‘verbatim’.

Figures: the figures have been simplified and provide a much better visualization of the complex data.
--

4) Conclusions
This section would improve if the authors were to focus on what this study adds to what already is known in the relevant field of research; they cite a lot of other studies undertaken, and most probably it’s the community perspective that has been assessed in the present study that adds something to the field. Knowing the existing literature and their own results well, the authors should try to summarize
these new elements in one or two sentences; in this, the authors should try to be as specific as possible, rather than giving general implications # page 14).

In the revised manuscript, more specific conclusions are given. It is focused on what the study adds, being the first study of this kind from India.

Conclusion and utilization of research results:
# Page 14; it is not stated clearly which kind of policy implications the results could have on present IEC activities. The paragraph remains a bit general and blurry...

The implications were mentioned specifically in the revised manuscript.

Quality of written English:
The language ahs improved, but the text still needs some polishing and editing especially towards the end of the paper).
The manuscript is thoroughly checked for language quality.

General conclusion:
The paper has improved a lot. Major points of criticism that remain and have not been fully addressed are the following:

1) Theoretical underlying approach of qualitative research
The present study is based on grounded theory approach and the same has been mentioned in the revised manuscript.

2) Use of existing health behavior theories in the research design and how the relate to the present findings
In the present study, it was primarily aimed to explore EMs of hypertension in these communities. The topic guide was developed with the help of previous studies and Kleinman’s EMs.

In fact, health behavioural theories such as health belief model (HBM) and social cognitive theory (SCT) were not considered to during designing of the study, though the study has captured some health beliefs. Hence, it is not claimed that the study has used existing behavioural theories. However, an attempt is made to mention the health beliefs viz., perceived susceptibility, seriousness and self efficacy, in the results and conclusions section.

3) Presentation of results not differentiated according to different data collection Techniques
Though the study has used different data collection techniques, the results were presented based on data from both the types of data. This is mainly because, the issues emerged in both types of data were similar and comparable. However, the issues that occurred more specifically during in-depth interviews and FGDs were mentioned towards the end of the results section in the revised manuscript.
4) Emphasis on new findings that this research has elicited
As suggested, the study findings were highlighted in conclusion and the implications of the study were mentioned.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
The manuscript is thoroughly checked for language quality.

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

**Declaration of competing interests:** As declared previously, I have no competing interests.