Reviewer’s report

Title: Determining adult type 2 diabetes-related health care needs in an indigenous population from rural Guatemala: A mixed methods preliminary study.

Version: 2 Date: 31 October 2012

Reviewer: Vanessa Johnston

Reviewer’s report:

The authors have done a good job in responding to my comments on their and I think the paper has greatly improved. The Discussion in particular is much stronger. There are, however, some outstanding issues that I think need addressing prior to publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. This is a very lengthy paper for what it in essence a small exploratory study. I suggest the authors attempt to be more succinct where possible, particularly in the Abstract, Background and Results section. This would improve readability.

2. Regarding the qualitative data collection, the authors should include in the methods section that the interviewees were a convenience sample of diabetic patients attending the health program.

3. I am not really sure what the comparison of demographic data between the qual and quant sample add, and why it is “reassuring” that they largely matched - except to say that the qual sample were largely representative of the audit sample, which we might expect as the qual sample was essentially drawn from the audit sample (i.e. diabetics receiving care through the health program). What’s more interesting is how representative the audit sample is of the wider population of Indigenous diabetics? This appears unknown based on available data, except that the preponderance of women in this sample is likely not representative of the wider population and the authors note their sample may have higher rates of comorbidities. I think these points should be more clearly emphasised in the limitations (i.e. pull all points about generalisability into one paragraph in the limitations section).

4. The authors note there were 51 closed-ended questions concerning knowledge etc. but then give an example of an open-ended question. A closed-ended question is a question format that limits respondents with a list of answer choices from which they must choose or only allows respondents a one-word answer (e.g. yes/no, age, sex etc.) It appears to me that most of the questions in the interview were indeed open-ended and therefore the reason why the authors chose to quantify this qual data is unclear, especially with such a small sample (n=23). If the authors wish to quantify this data they should provide a justification for it and describe in detail how they coded the qual data into quantifiable chunks (did they have a list of pre-specified codes that they applied...
to the data?). Because the themes are well described in the qual results section, I would suggest deleting the tables 2-4 and describing their analysis as ‘thematic’ – I actually think this is a more accurate descriptor of their analysis.

5. “Quantitative description of chart review.’
This is a cumbersome title – suggest ‘Findings of Chart Review.’

Authors do not need to repeat the statistical tests they used for comparison of samples, as this is in the methods section. The comparison between the two samples can be summarised in one sentence.

My advice last time was not to repeat data points in text and the tables but the authors do need to summarise the main findings from this data – this is missing here now. This summary has made its way to the Discussion and needs to be moved to this section in Results.

Minor Essential Revisions not for publication

1. Table 1 – “Duration of diabetes” would be better expressed as “time since diagnosis” as patients may have been diabetic prior to diagnosis.

2. Table 5
- “Duration of diabetes” would be better expressed as “time since diagnosis” as patients may have been diabetic prior to diagnosis.
- Glycosylated Hb is the mean (SD) not %
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