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Response to reviewers comments

To Editor:

We have made some corrections of references in the text (not redmarked) as we became aware of some minor mistakes.
We have also made some minor changes in ”conclusion” in abstract and in the manuscript (redmarked).

We have also made the required changes; uploaded a copy of the original questionnaire as an additional file (in Swedish unfortunately) and reorganised the legends for tables according to your recommendations.

Reviewer 1:

Comment: House's theory of social support should be discussed in the Background of the manuscript including a brief description of each of it's four components.

Response: We have included a brief description of House’s theory according to the reviewers suggestion.

Comment: Please clarify the last sentence on page 9. 16 women reported that their care provider had guided them to information on the Internet whild 36 women had not received this suggestion. What about the other 22 women? What advise did they receive?

Response: Questions related to this section, page 9 (Internet-provided information and communication in relation to diabetes and childbearing), were only answered by a subset of women (those who actually had used the internet to search for information concerning pregnancy, childbirth and parenthood, see first sentence page 10) and we have added the remaining part of women who received guidance from others than care providers. We do understand that this need to be clarified and we have also moved this sentence to becoming the last sentence in the paragraph (at page 10, redmarked) and hope that it now becomes clearer for the reader by these two changes.

Reviewer 2:

Comment: One details is that it would be recommended to keep the result section in the abstract in either percentage (%) or numbers. Current abstract refers to both which is slightly confusing.

Response: We have omitted one sentence in the abstract (after the redmarked sentence) presenting numbers instead of percentage. We have also changed the redmarked sentence to percentage instead of numbers in line with the reviewer’s suggestion.

Comment: … there is a few places where the language could be more succinct for example 3rd last line on page 13 “Many women obviously initiate this information-seeking on their own (if they initiate they start it on their own so the last three words are not necessary).
Response: We have changed the sentence according to the suggestion and red marked the sentence.