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Reviewer’s report:

1. As stated previously, I believe the article is well written and for the most part, easy to understand. The background for the study is well explained – the increasing epidemic of type 2 diabetes with resultant potential for foot pathology and amputations. The lack of consistent use of foot self-care behaviors and the need for interventions that emphasize not just knowledge but also psychological constructs that affect behavior is explained and provides justification for the study.

2. I continue to agree with the use of self-efficacy as a theoretical construct. The authors have highlighted an important gap in the literature on foot care – the relationship between foot self-care and foot care self-efficacy. The study design is well formulated – focusing on those patients with peripheral neuropathy. The measurement tools used are well explained and the limitations of validity testing are given.

3. The authors have changed the statistical analysis and have addressed my concerns regarding multiple t tests and type 1 error. The explanation about the recoding of the variable is acceptable.

4. 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.

5. I continue to believe that this is a weakness in the study design and that it might be useful to address the lack of the measurement of knowledge.

6. 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.”

7. The writing is acceptable.
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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