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Response from the comments made on the first revision- 15th December 2008.

The authors of the above manuscript thank and are grateful to the reviewers for their comments on the first revision. Below are the responses to these comments, to be read with the edited version of the manuscript.

**Reviewer 1**

**Discretionary revision:**
I agree with the authors that having some statistical significance somewhat negates the analysis of power; however, that was a weak relationship and only with one behavioral subscale. Another avenue to take would be to report internal consistency scores for each of the subscales to verify reliability of both subscales.

**Response**
The issue of power with respect to this issue is now discussed in the limitations chapter of the discussion:

“The significance of the correlation analyses may be underestimated as the sample size was small, increasing the chance of a type 2 statistical error being made. A larger sample size would have ensured a more powerful result with respect to the small effect sizes found.”

**Discretionary revision:**
I concur with the authors that since they did not measure outcome expectancy they wouldn't want to report this hypothesized relationship; however, it is misconceiving to say that “This has implications for health promotion strategies that focus on developing self-efficacy to encourage preventive behaviour.”

It certainly “may” have implications because as the authors state now in the conclusion: “The usefulness of measuring foot-care self-efficacy beliefs using currently available instruments is limited in people with diabetes and loss of protective sensation.”

**Response**
The sentence “(t)his has implications for health promotion strategies that focus on developing self-efficacy to encourage preventive behaviour” has now been deleted. The previous sentence (and now the final sentence of the paragraph) now links directly with the conclusion, without the speculative sentence.
Reviewer 2
Firstly, in the abstract it could be more simply expressed that this was a questionnaire study in which participants filled in a foot care confidence scale together with the principal investigator.

Response
We are not entirely sure it can be more simply stated in the abstract. It is stated that the participants completed a self-report questionnaire- the title of which is the “Foot Care Confidence Scale” and we do not believe there is another such questionnaire with the same title or theme.

We respectfully request no change be made.

Secondly, the conclusion in abstract and paper is not in agreement which need to be changed.

Response
The text in the abstract has now been changed to better align with that of the text (main change in bold):

“There is little association between foot-care self-efficacy beliefs and actual foot-care behaviour. The usefulness of measuring foot-care self-efficacy beliefs to assess actual self foot-care behaviour using currently available instruments is limited in people with diabetes and loss of protective sensation.”