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Dear Editor,

Hereby we resubmit the manuscript `Extraordinary exposed in early motherhood- a qualitative study exploring experiences of mothers with diabetes´ for final evaluation to be published in BMC Women's Health. We have considered the comments from the reviewers and have responded to them down below. We hope that these actions fulfil the requirements. If anything is missing, please let us know.

On behalf of both authors,

Carina Sparud-Lundin (corresponding author)

Response to reviewer 2:

We are grateful for the opportunity to add details on requested issues in line with comments from reviewer 2. According to this reviewer’s overall assessment, we understand that the linguistic quality has been improved. We have considered the reviewer’s comments as follows:

1. “The authors define “extraordinary exposed” however, they use the word “exposed” in the definition on page 7. This term could still be clarified more. Are there references to support the use of this term? Is there a theory that supports this term?”

Response: We appreciate the remarks. First, we have slightly changed the definition of the term “exposure” at page 7, redmarked). The meaning of “extraordinary exposure” is described in the findings with deepened interpretation in the final part “Conclusive interpretation”. Secondly, in order to clarify the concept of “extraordinary exposure”, we have related the concept to an existing theory (Rogan et al. 1997) (page 19, first paragraph in the Discussion section, redmarked)

2. “In the initial review of the paper, it was suggested that the authors include additional information about the various socio-demographic backgrounds of the participants. This would help the reader to know more about the participants and whether any salient themes emerged based on their various backgrounds. The authors didn’t respond to this suggestion and this was not included in the revision.”

Response: We apologize for the missing response on socio-demographic factors. In the first resubmitted version we actually already had altered the text (page 21, third paragraph) but we forgot to explicitly respond to this comment. We have added some new information about socio-demographic factors in the Method section (Page 6, paragraph 1, redmarked). Furthermore we have briefly developed text in the Discussion section (page 21-22, redmarked).