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General

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Yes. Good description in the introduction of westernization/urbanization as the cause behind the increasing prevalence of DM in Oman.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

Information about what kind of sampling technique is used is missing and need to be provided.

Some questions need to be answered in the section:
1) What about literacy among participants in the study?

2) What methods were used to guarantee trustworthiness/rigour (validity in quantitative studies) in this study?

3) What about data saturation?

4) Who were the moderator and assistant moderator (first and second author? Somebodyelse?) and what were their qualifications?

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The question is how trustworthiness/rigour is handled and the matter of saturation of data, please see comments above under 2.

The results part is good but some minor changes are needed:

1) Under the heading “Inexperienced doctors and nurses” the text would read better by starting with matters about lack of competence and inexperience.

2) Under the heading “long waiting times” illuminating quotation is needed.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Table 1 – Heading of table needs additional information that it concerns Oman.

Appendix 1 and Table 2 – headings FGDs should be exchanged by Focus group discussions (FGDs) in Appendix 1 and in the study population with focus-group discussions (FGD 1 …) in table 2.

Table 2 – calculations should be in Medians and not means as the samples are small! Please give range for each group or as an alternative give range for the whole group in the text instead of in the table.
Educational level – please specify level in left column (primary, secondary, university etc) and give numbers of persons in each group under the columns of each FGD. The heading of the table could be changed so that you have FGD 1 and 2 complemented with males beneath and n=13 and FGD 3 and 4 with females beneath and n=14. Then information about total number of participants could be deleted from left column.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

In the discussion part influence of culture in relation to life-style is discussed but not in relation to organisational matters which is of importance in relation to patient/provider interaction, and thus need to be developed. Another important issue is the influence of religion and culture and its influence on expectations on health care staff and their roles as nurses/doctors. Hofstede is a reference source that might be useful to read and add.

Under limitations the text is expressed in accordance with quantitative research and not qualitative! Qualitative results can never be generalized and random sampling is not used! Change concepts and talk about transferability and trustworthiness and purposefully or convenience samples (depending on what you actually used)!

Under this section data saturation need to be discussed.

Otherwise, the discussion is ok.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

How do we know it is Type 2 DM that is studied? If included in the text (methodological section) – the title is ok. The abstract is ok.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
For me as a foreigner the language is very good!! And the article is easy to read.

Thus, major compulsory revisions are needed before publication.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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