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December 13, 2012

The Editor,
BMC International Health and Human Rights

Dear Editor,

Re: Re-submission of the manuscript; Use of traditional medicine for the treatment of diabetes mellitus in Eastern Uganda: a qualitative exploration of reasons for choice MS ID: 1633867886121507

Please receive the revised version of the manuscript entitled: Use of traditional medicine for the treatment of diabetes mellitus in Eastern Uganda: a qualitative exploration of reasons for choice by Elizeus Rutebemberwa, Muhamadi Lubega, Sheila K Katureebe, Abanga Oundo, Francis Kiweewa and David Mukanga.

The following is the point-by-point response to the reviewer’s comments:

1. In the methods section, there is still some information that belongs to the finding section e.g. information a top of page 3 on health insurance and drug stock outs. In second paragraph on Page 3 - last four lines on drug stock outs.

We thank the reviewer for this comment. The information on page 3 on health insurance and drug stock outs has been deleted as can be seen on top of page 3. The information on drug stock outs has also been deleted as can be seen in the second paragraph on Page 3.

2. On Page 4, authors need to explain why they chose FGDs. Just need to include a convincing explanation e.g. about how this is a sensitive subject and how one-on-one interviews with patients had the possibility of introducing bias.
We agree with the reviewer on this comment. We have inserted an explanation why we chose FGDs due to the sensitivity of the subject something that would introduce reporting bias in a one-to-one interview. This can be seen on page 4 second paragraph lines 7 – 9.

3. In the conclusion section, the authors need to discuss the implications of these findings. They need to discuss the "So What?" question in order to make their findings useful.

We thank the reviewer very much for this comment. The discussion of “So What?” has been inserted in the conclusion as can be seen on Page 15 in the last four lines of the paragraph on the conclusion.