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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Methods section: Overall, methods are not well described.

a. There is no description of the research design (i.e., qualitative methodological tradition). Author indicates that a grounded theory approach to data analysis was used but no other acknowledgement of how grounded theory guided the approach was included.

b. A framework was acknowledged as a guide for the 2nd part of data collection but not for the overall study.

c. In light of working with Aboriginal population, it is important to include some discussion of how the community was engaged in planning and implementing the research. How were the study questions identified? How did the researcher gain access to the community? Facilitators/barriers.

d. Sampling methods are described as “reflexive”. What does this mean? How was theoretical sampling (consistent with grounded theory) used for the different groups?

e. Last sentence of first paragraph in methods: “Results are expressed graphically or textually…”. How were these approaches employed in this research? Relevance?

f. 3rd paragraph – lacks citation for Kleinman’s Explanatory Model Framework. Also, why is this model a good fit for this study? Making this explicit would be beneficial.

g. Re: the semi-structured interview guide, was this framing around the 5 themes guided by previous work? Where did the 5-theme framework come from (cite previous research, as relevant) and what was the rationale for adding a 6th theme in this study?

h. “These interviews also contained a fixed response interview to assess cultural consensus.” What does this mean? Although results are reported elsewhere, this statement lacks sufficient detail for the reader.

i. What was the rationale for interviewing advisors prior to the women? How was an explanatory approach used with the women to explore emerging themes from the data analysis associated with the advisors?
j. Further detail re: analysis and development of the themes would strengthen this manuscript. Although a “constant comparison method associated with grounded theory” is acknowledged, there is no mention of how theoretical saturation was achieved, nor if/how theoretical sampling was used to achieve this saturation.

2. Background section:

   a. Overall, this section is lengthy without much linking of ideas. E.g., the section on health care context would benefit from a description of why this context is so important for Aboriginal women. How does this process work or fail this group of women? It would help to move beyond the description to tell the reader ‘so what’. Building of argument re: importance of study could also be strengthened.

   b. First cited reference: Acknowledging the influence of past discriminatory policies, this report appears to recommend equity rather than equality.

   c. Health care experiences: First sentence – “although the need for a better understanding is recognized…” By whom?

   d. Health care experiences: Third sentence lacks citation.

   e. Health care experiences: Second paragraph. Issues with flow of ideas & clarity. Last sentence: specific to diabetes management? Or prenatal care?

   f. What was the rationale for inclusion of providers and women? What unique insights could each group provide?

3. Participant Description: This section is quite lengthy and could be cut down. Some of this section would be more appropriately housed in the results section.

4. Ethics: This section lacks acknowledgement with respect to how this research is consistent with the TCPS2 – Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans Chapter 9 RESEARCH INVOLVING THE FIRST NATIONS, INUIT AND MÉTIS PEOPLES OF CANADA


5. Results:

   a. The first ‘category’ cited by the author Health Service Divisions lacks a description to define the category. It is unclear how the quote selected to start this section is connected with the ‘category’ name.

   b. For the first theme under this category Burden of Responsibility, the discussion that follows does not support the theme. There is a lack of discussion of this link until 2 pages later in the manuscript. The meaning of the first sentence of this section is unclear to the reader and the remainder of the paragraph, unfortunately, fails to illuminate the meaning.

   c. Throughout this section, there are some issues with the flow/linking of ideas.

   d. P. 13, there are again some issues with the flow of ideas. There are also some instances in which there are details lacking to contextualize participant/provider quotes, i.e., whether quotes illuminate particular concepts under the themes.
There are many individual accounts without a linking to supporting or contrasting cases.

e. At the end of p. 13, it is unclear whether some of the reporting is based on the author’s opinion or whether the statements were based on participant data. This issue arises again on p. 14 in the paragraph starting with “This displacement…”. It also arises on p. 18 in the paragraph starting with “Attempts to assist…”

f. On p. 15, at the bottom, the quotes do not appear to be linked to the lead in statement. On p. 17, starting the section on Patient and Caregiver Dynamics, the quote would benefit from a contextual lead-in statement.

g. P. 17, first statement lacks clarity.

h. Results section is very long and would benefit from some streamlining.

6. Tables:

a. There seems to be a discrepancy between Table 2 and the number of participants reported in the body of the paper. It would be useful to report the demographic data in this table with percentages. It appears that this table reports only on the women participants not the advisors? This could be more clearly labeled as such.

b. Tables 3 & 4 would be more useful as a reference to the reader if they were organized alphabetically by name.

7. Some issues with sentence structure:

• In abstract – Results statement
• Methods: second paragraph, first sentence – needs to be reworded for clarity
• Research process: “It was left up to the discretion of the individual or organization contacted whether one person chose to be interviewed or a group of advisors to form a focus group.” Issue with grammar/wording.
• Results: under Burden of Responsibility, paragraph starting with “Heather, a dietician…” – there are issues with sentence structure and vagueness.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Review references for accuracy and spelling.
2. Minor punctuation issues on p. 16 (last quote), p. 19 (quote by Diane)
3. Inconsistent management of quotes (Name, Role) in some places but not in others. Would be useful to consistently include.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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