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Author's response to reviews:

Response to Reviewers Report

Title: Self-care coping strategies in people with diabetes: a qualitative exploratory study

Both reviewers provided constructive comments which will help to make this paper more informative and useful for health professionals. The suggested changes have been addressed as follows:

Reviewer 1:

Background
- Point 1: The 1st sentence, 4th paragraph, characterizing the provider’s role ‘as a small one,’ was deleted.
- Point 2: Last paragraph, 1st sentence referencing a ‘dearth of information’ pm the burden of diabetes was deleted.
- A brief discussion introduced the theories at the end of the background section.

Methods
- Point 3: The description of the study sample was modified as suggested to include a numeric description of the study sample. For example, we targeted approximately 50% males……

Data Analysis and Credibility
- Points 4, 5, and 6: The data was analysed and coded by the lead researcher. A random sample of five interviews (including audio tapes, field notes, and coding framework) were reviewed by a Senior Qualitative Researcher in the department. The Senior Qualitative Researcher provided written feedback to the lead researcher on coding and provided corroborating evidence of the logic of the decision-making. The methodology and final coding framework was also reviewed by one of the co-authors with extensive knowledge in qualitative
research methods (CPB).

-The website listed in the draft submitted is no longer active. The Annotape software that was used for coding was developed by Dr Laura Frost the Senior Qualitative Researcher who reviewed the data analysis.

Results

-Point 7: The term ‘ideal’ to describe the patient types was dropped as suggested.

Discussion

-Point 8: 1st paragraph, second sentence. Discussing the benefits of treatment… has been deleted.

-Point 9: The discussion section was reframed to use the theories to help explain the patient behaviours described by each type.

-Point 10: The concept of type was introduced in the abstract and since the term ‘ideal’ was dropped we did not feel that we needed to discuss in the introduction.

Study limitations

- Point 11: The concern about the study limitations has been rewritten to address the reviewer’s concerns:

The study sample was heterogeneous and included both patients with types 1 and 2 diabetes which may account for some of the differences in coping strategies. The qualitative data was not longitudinal; therefore, no inferences can be made about behaviour changes that occurred over time. There was some disconfirming evidence among the patient types regarding the decision making process patients used to adopt new health-related behaviours that should have been probed in further interviews, but this was not possible due to time and resource limitations.

Reviewer 2

-Point 1: The claim of limited understanding about how people with diabetes self-care was deleted and additional references were added and included in the background and discussion (Parry et al. and Ockleford et al.).

-Point 2: The varied, heterogeneous sample was listed as a study limitation and gender, type of diabetes, and regimen were included in the discussion section.

-Point 3: The discussion section was reframed to include how gender, type of diabetes, and regimen influenced self-care coping strategies and differed among the patient types.

-Point 4: Figure 1 was revised and made clearer.
-Point 5: The term ‘Reactive Manager’ was changed to ‘Proactive Manager’

-Point 6: The fact that the interviews were one off rather than longitudinal was mentioned as a limitation as suggested.

-Point 7: The data tables were made clearer and tagged with gender and type of regimen.

This concludes our responses to the reviewers suggested changes.