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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for responding to the feedback and making substantial revisions. The manuscript is much improved. Please see below a list of discretionary revisions for which the authors may choose to ignore.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Background
   a. Paragraph 6, 2nd sentence: typo “received”

2. Results
   a. “Self-consciousness…” section, paragraph 2: As all but three participants were recruited through online support groups/Facebook pages who were the interviewees who reported avoiding these sites? Was it those 3 participants recruited from clinical practices? If so then perhaps make this clear.
   b. “Type 2 diabetes” section, paragraph 1, 4th sentence, “fatness, laziness, eating too much candy”: this terminology should either be in quotation marks to signify that it came from participants or should be changed to reflect formal language, such as suboptimal lifestyle choices.
   c. “Distress is not an issue”, first sentence: remove “in their interviews”
   d. “Distress is not an issue”, 2nd paragraph, 6th sentences: Authors write that the 4 participants who did not report distress were “used to dealing with high stress environments”. This is not clear from the quotes and a background in finance does not assume that participants worked in high-stress environments. Perhaps clarify this statement.
   e. “Managing distress”, 1 paragraph, 3rd sentence: typo – “became” should be “become”.
   f. “Social support for healthcare professionals”, 2nd paragraph: “Hba1c scores” might instead be referred to “HbA1c levels”. This terminology removes the association of a pass or fail test.
   g. Support from family members”, Quote starting “I went to this diabetes focus group…”, 2nd sentence: Perhaps missing the word “I” or maybe “they” between “that” and “could”?
   h. “Support from family members”, 3rd paragraph, 3rd sentence: perhaps a better wording for “regulating” would be “attending to”? Not sure how someone is able to regulate another person’s emotions?
i. “Support from peers”, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence: Add “These” before Interviewees to signify that you are talking about a subgroup – not all participants.

3. Discussion

a. 2nd paragraph: content could be reduced as it is quite repetitious.

b. 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence: “restricted or disadvantaged” in what way?

c. 3rd paragraph: I don’t think participants would have described other people with type 2 diabetes as “subjects”.

d. 3rd paragraph: The discussion of females feeling like they may be categorised at having type 2 diabetes because of weight fluctuation is very interesting. However, no data is supplied about participants BMI nor any quotes referring to participants concern that their weight/body image may portray others to think they were overweight or have type 2 diabetes.

e. 4th paragraph: “They desire to build positive relationships with health care”. This sentence appears quite out of place in the section of the paragraph and could be better connected to ideas being presented in this paragraph.

f. 6th paragraph, 1st sentence: The meaning of the first sentence is lost due to the extensive length of the sentence and the contradictory statement which appears in the second half of the sentence.
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