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Reviewer's report:

This qualitative paper sought to describe patients' reactions to being diagnosed with type 2 diabetes and informed about recommended treatments and lifestyle changes, and potential complications of the disease. Participants were diagnosed up to 12 months prior to interview. Understanding how those with newly diagnosed T2DM feel about recommended lifestyle changes as part of their diabetes treatment and their perceived risk of developing complications is a worthwhile and important research question. Overall the paper needs to be more concisely presented, and the grammar needs to be improved to ensure clear communication of the key points. For example, I do not think it is necessary to include statements such as. "Research interviews can bring you closer to problems from the point of view of the interviewees (15)." (Background section, page 4). Discussing the results within the context of other similar studies that have been undertaken within a relatively short time after diagnosis would strengthen the discussion. Specific comments follow:

ABSTRACT

* Overall the abstract could be more focused and written more concisely with essential details provided, and reflecting changes made to the main body of the paper.

* While the aim of the study is described, please word it more clearly.

* The statement in the conclusions about the study results might help improve doctor-patient communication needs to be revised, as the results do not specifically suggest that communication is poor.

BACKGROUND

* I was surprised to read that "Usually a diabetes patient visits the GP and the nurse once a year respectively, more frequently if needed." (2nd paragraph). Please clarify if the 'once a year' visit is an annual diabetes check-up only, with other visits for glucose monitoring, repeat prescriptions, etc taking place during the year.
* Please include references for the statements about the treatment recommendations for lower blood lipids for those with diabetes compared with those without diabetes in the 3rd paragraph.

* The reference (#13) for the comment about people's reactions to a diagnosis of diabetes does not appear to be correct. This particular paper is a review that examines diabetes and quality of life improvements through modifying life style. Suggestions for papers that specifically examine people's reactions to a diagnosis of diabetes include:


METHODS

* Please explain how the participants were recruited, that is, how was it decided which patients in the practice to approach and invite to participate in the study?

* Was there a sampling procedure, that is, was the sampling a purposeful selection? Were potential participants invited from a practice list? Was an advertisement posted in the health centre?

* Presumably a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes in the last 12 months was an inclusion criteria

* Were there any exclusion criteria e.g. age limits, treated with lifestyle change only?

* It would be more informative to include the interview schedule in a table, rather than including a couple of questions in the text (interview subsection, page 5).

Minor - typographical and grammar

* 'The GP had tHree general topics….' is probably meant to read as 'The GP had tHree general topics….' (interview subsection, page 5).

* It would be helpful to define 'meaning units' for readers who are not familiar with this qualitative analysis phrase (analysis subsection, page 6).
* It is not necessary to include reference to results and Tables 2 and 3 in the Methods section (analysis subsection, end of page 6). Also, it is unusual for the first reference to a table being 'Table 2', and not 'Table 1'.

RESULTS

* In Table 1, please include the length of time each participant had been diagnosed with diabetes.

* As Table 2 presents the analysis 'in progress', it could be included as a supplementary table.

* Although this is a qualitative study, it would be informative to present the number of participants rather than descriptors such as 'several', 'the majority', 'some'.

* It is described that 'Some succeeded in long-term changes whereas the majority returned to old habits or did not manage to change their behaviour at all.' Is the reference to 'long-term changes' correct, as participants were reported to have been diagnosed with diabetes for less than 12 months? Please alter text accordingly.

DISCUSSION

* As noted above, it would be informative and help with the interpretation to provide an indication of how many of the ten participants were 'the majority', particularly as 'several people reacted with denial' and 'some participants associated the diagnosis with guilt' (see I. Reaction to diagnosis subsection of the results section, page 9).

* On page 15, it is stated that 'Diabetes has become a silent disease, easy to ignore in life.' (1st paragraph, page 15) I am not sure that this statement is correct, particularly if complications develop, as in my experience this is usually not the case. However, if it is a correct statement, then it should be referenced.

* The discussion about lifestyle change would be better informed by explaining what is typically offered to patients with newly diagnosed with diabetes in the study practice setting.

* The discussion about fear of insulin needs to be referenced.

* Visual impairment and blindness from diabetes may not be particularly common complications in Sweden today, but this is not the case worldwide. Perhaps this is because there is a good organised retinal screening system in place, and it is because of this that the physician does not focus on diabetes eye disease. If this is the case, then this needs to be explicitly stated in order to help determine if the results from this study are generalizable to other places.
* It would be worthwhile to include comments regarding study limitations in relation to the characteristics of the sample of 10 given it was a predominantly older male group. Do the authors think that the short 10-15 minute interviews elicited all the relevant information?

* The first sentence of the conclusion is not entirely consistent with the first sentence of the discussion.

* The last sentence of the conclusion is somewhat overstated given the results presented. Further, it is not clear what aspect of communication needs to be improved.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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