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Dear Chief Editor,

We enclose our revised manuscript ‘Web-based information for pregnant women and new mothers with type 1 diabetes- a description of the development process ’ for your consideration, for publication in BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making. We have responded to the reviewers comments (see response letter and red marked revisions in the manuscript down below) but could not both meet the major revision needs and shorten the article to the required numbers of words in a corresponding article. Previous published correspondence articles seem to have exceeded the word limit. We look forward to hear your response to this. The resubmission has been delayed as we have tried to get in contact with the editorial team regarding the article format.

Best Regards, on behalf of the authors

Karolina Linden
Response letter:

Reviewer 1

The authors developed a web-based support for women with type 1 diabetes during pregnancy, childbirth and the first year of childhood. The seven stages of development of the web-site are precisely described. The validation of the information by five mothers is questionable. No results are provided.

1. Two main unresolved problems in pregnancy in women with type 1 diabetes, contraception and preconception care, do not seem to appear distinctly on the web-site.

Response: We acknowledge this problem and the lack of support given in these matters. However, the focus of the web-intervention is pregnancy and the post-partum period. The women getting access to our information are already pregnant. Information about contraception and preconception care focuses on a different target group.

2. Although providing information through a web-site is potentially interesting, the authors described precisely the methodology to develop their own web-site, but no results are available. In other words, the information by users of the web-site needs to be compared by non-users of the web-site to evaluate the potential benefit for the women. In the absence of results no conclusion can be drawn. The absence of results is a serious deficiency in the process of submitting a research study. In this form, this manuscript is not suitable for publication.

Response: In line with the editor’s recommendation and both reviewers’ comments we reformat the manuscripts as a correspondence article.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being Published

Response: The text is language edited by a professional reviewer. However, we have reviewed the text again

Reviewer 2

Major compulsory revisions:

1. This is not a regular research article and should be labeled differently. I does not report any findings but describes the process of developing web-based patient information.

Response: In line with the editor’s recommendation and both reviewers’ comments we reformat the manuscripts as a correspondence article.

2. Background should include basic principles for development of patient information. There is extensive literature on information-giving and the challenges and problems related to that.
Response: We are grateful for these comments and have elaborated on this issue (p 2)

Method
3. Is participatory design really democratic? Isn’t interactive a better description of the concept?

Response: We refer to both Gregory et al 2003 and Spinuzzi et al 2005 who claims that participatory design can be seen as a democratic way to develop a project. In the way that these authors describe it, we agree. We do believe that we fulfill the principles of participatory design according to Gregory and Spinuzzi. This is why we prefer to keep participatory design instead of interactive design (p.3)

4. Different levels of participation is mentioned but not desribed and the level chosen for this project not clarified.

Response: we have described different levels of participation and reported our chosen level (p. 3)

5. The link to the trial needs to be better explained.

Response: We have expanded the information in order to better link to the trial (p 2)

Results
6. It is unclear whether these seven stages just happened along the developmental process or if they had clearly been outlined before starting. I would suspect that at least some of the stages had been agreed on beforehand, and if so this part of the text would fit better in the method section. The description on what actually happened during those different stages can still fit in the result section.

Response: We agree with these comments and have revised in line with the suggestions (p. 4-5)

Discussion and conclusion
Two major things need to be discussed.
7. 1. If this was a participatory design, why were the target group members involved at such a late stage? I find this process to be very expert-driven even if the target group had some influence in the later stages of the development. But again, they were not involved in step 6 and 7 which could also have been useful to help ensure the web-site became user-friendly.

Response: The whole idea of MODIAB-Web is based on the information provided from the target group (the MODIAB project) (p. 2) and we have developed this issue further in the discussion (p. 15). Furthermore, we have added information of participation of target group members in stage 6 (p. 11)

8. 2. Cultural suitability
Every fourth baby born in Sweden has a mother with foreign origin. How were the needs and opinions of these mothers taken into account? How can this web-site
be useful for them?

Response: This is now acknowledge and discussed in the limitations (p. 14).

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being Published

Response: The text is language edited by a professional reviewer. However, we have reviewed the text again.