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The Editor-in-Chief
Trials

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

We have uploaded a revised copy of our manuscript titled “Rationale and design: telephone-delivered behavioral skills interventions for blacks with type 2 diabetes.” We have addressed all the issues raised as detailed below. The changes are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript. This manuscript represents original work we would like considered for publication in Trials as a study protocol. We look forward to the acceptance of our manuscript.

Sincerely,
Leonard Egede, M.D., M.S.
Professor
Department of Medicine
Medical University of South Carolina
Charleston, SC

Detailed Response to Reviewer Comments

This protocol is very clearly reported – the authors are to be congratulated.

Thank you!

Abstract
How about replacing “Blacks (African Americans)” with “African Americans” and “Whites” with “American Whites”.

Done – See changes in revised manuscript.

Please delete “prospective” in the abstract and everywhere in the body of the text (e.g., page 6). By their design, randomized trials are prospective.

Done – See changes in revised manuscript.

Do the authors want to state the % change in the primary outcome (as stated on
The absolute percent change referred to on page 16 is for sample size calculation. We do not know what the absolute difference will be at the end of the study, so we did not include it in the abstract.

Body of manuscript
On page 8 (and everywhere else in the manuscript) please replace “subjects” with “participants”.

Done – See changes in revised manuscript.

On page 10 I’d like to try and better organize the reporting of the interventions. How about using 4 headings corresponding to the interventions and within each heading group the specific interventions for that group – merging the information on pages 10-14 – perhaps this is an easier read.

Done – See changes in revised manuscript.

Also, I’d like the authors to submit all of the intervention documents (e.g., as reported on page 11) as these can be included on the Journal’s website. My goal is to get as close to what Glasziou and colleagues recommend when reporting information about interventions (Glasziou P, Meats E, Heneghan C, Shepperd S. What is missing from descriptions of treatment in trials and reviews? BMJ 2008;336:1472–1474).

We agree this is important. However, many of the intervention content materials are copyrighted and we are not at liberty to share them on the web. In addition, the manuals are being developed for publication and are currently copyrighted so we are unable to make them publicly available as well. We expect to have products that can be shared with the research community at the end of the study.