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Reviewer's report:

Strengths: Strengths of this study include the use of qualitative methods to explore the values and practices of self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) in Black Caribbean and South Asian Canadians. The manuscript is well-written and contributes to the current literature on blood glucose monitoring. Understanding factors that support or impede SMBG in Non-White adults with type 2 diabetes is an important first step in addressing barriers to diabetes self-management.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

Conclusion, Paragraph 1: The authors need to discuss how the findings of this study inform future research. More specifically, the authors should describe plans for their future research that build on these findings.

Discretionary Revisions:

Abstract, Conclusion Paragraph: The authors introduce cost as an important barrier identified by the participants; however, barriers (i.e., cost) were not discussed in the Results paragraph. The Conclusion section of the Abstract (as well as the Manuscript) should not introduce new information but rather provide an interpretation of what the findings mean in the larger context of the problem/issue.

Methods, Data Collection, Paragraph 1: The methods would benefit from inclusion of additional information regarding the interview process. Did the same researcher conduct all of the interviews? Was the interviewer trained in qualitative interviewing? How were the interview questions developed?

Results, Theme One, Paragraph 1: The authors should consider including a quotation in this paragraph or Table 3 illustrating the participants’ perceived susceptibility for future diabetes-related complications. The only quotation included from this theme reflected one participants’ lack of perceived severity for diabetes and its complications.

Results, Themes 4 & 5: The fourth and fifth theme titles are too brief and far-reaching. The authors should consider more descriptive titles that explain the findings (e.g., Cues to action --> Factors supporting/impeding SMBG or Perceived support for SMBG).
Limitations, Paragraph 1: The authors should address the issue of selection bias and social desirability as limitations to the qualitative study.

Discussion, Paragraphs 5 & 6: In paragraphs 5 & 6, the authors refer to findings from two participants and one participant respectively. In light of the small sample size and the hypothesis-generating nature of qualitative research, the authors should be careful to not reach beyond the scope of their data. These findings are too preliminary to draw any strong conclusions about SMBG in Black Caribbean and South Asian adults.

Conclusion, Paragraph 1: The authors state that the findings show similar themes emerging from Black Caribbean and South Asian adults compared to other studies with predominantly White adults. However, the next sentence calls attention to observed differences across gender and culture. What are these differences? The authors need to clearly describe these differences in greater detail.
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