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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1:

The main objective of this study was to develop a diabetes digital storytelling intervention with and for immigrant and refugee populations.

However, it is not observed a review of each of the intervention stories (storytelling intervention), only comments that were made based on the results of the focus groups. It is convenient that you present the stories intervention summary.
Or the primary study objective and title should change, because no intervention results are displayed, only a very good qualitative situational diagnosis of the main problems facing the immigrant population with diabetes, which are obviously fundamental for the development of an education intervention to health.

*In this paper, we described all of the formative work to inform a digital storytelling intervention with immigrant and refugee groups through a CBPR approach. We provided in-depth results of the qualitative work and story-building process that we believe will be useful to other communities and partnerships. Pilot testing of the intervention in a randomized clinical trial is the subject of future work. To highlight the fact that this paper describes more than the focus groups, we have added more detail regarding the intervention products to the manuscript (Lines 293-298).

Moreover, in Table # 1 is missing information.

*Thank you. We have made corrections to Table 1.

Reviewer #2:

Review of the manuscript "Stories for Change: Development of a diabetes Digital Storytelling Intervention for Refugees and Immigrants to Minnesota using Qualitative Methods" submitted to BMC Public Health.

Many thanks for giving me the opportunity to read and review your interesting and timely manuscript on storytelling as a tool for diabetes care. The community-based participatory research has many strengths.

*Thank you

I only have a few suggestions for possible improvements:

1. Data collection, p8, row 164-169: Please give examples on formulated questions and/ or upload the focus group moderator guide as an additional file.
   *We have included our focus group moderator guide to consider including as supplementary material or as an appendix.

2. Focus groups: Please describe the size of each focus group
   *We have included the size of the focus groups. (Line 172)

3. Time frame: Please provide information on when the study was conducted
   *We have added information on when each of the phases of this study were conducted. (Lines 139, 173 and 279-280)
4. Data analysis, p9, row 182: "Data analysis was done by a team...". Is this team the authors, or other academic and community partners? How many?

*The team who did the analysis consisted of four RHCP academic and community partners, who are included as authors in the paper. (Line 187)

5. Discussion: please write something about how the focus group discussions went. Did the participants speak freely, were there any problems? Were you satisfied with the group sizes? Did they differ?

*We have included a description on the nature of the focus group discussions. “The focus group participants spoke freely and were very engaged in the discussions. Given constraints in transportation, two of the focus group discussions began a little later than the scheduled times, but lasted as long as needed to review all the questions in the moderator guide”. (Lines 177 – 180)