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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer 1:

1. Aim of the paper: This research aims to explore the personal experiences of participants with diabetes using prescription footwear, so as to better understand how footwear decisions are made and influenced in the Singaporean population. (line 99 - 102)

2. I have added "a qualitative study" to the article title

3. I have changed the term "regulate" to "influence" throughout the entire article

4. I have re-formatted the title of the themes according to your suggestion

5. However, we did not collect demographic data apart from gender and thus are not able to include that in the article.

Reviewer 2:

1. I have given a brief justification for bracketing under analysis (174-175). However, as I have already elaborated on the need for bracketing and suspending one's biases/pre-conceived notions in the earlier segment (interviews), I did not elaborate further as it would be very repetitive.

2. FINDINGS have been retitled as RESULTS and a table (table 1) illustrating the super-ordinate and sub-themes have been included in the submission.

3. Unfortunately, we did not collect demographic results other than gender and the fact that they have been prescribed prescription footwear by a healthcare professional, as they were not pertinent to our immediate study aims. Thus are not able to provide a demographic table of the participants.
4. I have included a reference on the sample's potential cultural predisposition re: pragmatism and displaying of emotions (line 201). It is:


5. I have also reformatted the results and discussion segment. I'm aware that this is likely a personal preference as Reviewer 1 seems to like the article being formatted with the results and discussion intertwined. Kindly review if the points are brought across clearer this way.

6. I have also included the segment discussing challenges of interviewing participants within the limitations segment as suggested (line 556 - 565)

7. Information on the number of male and females have also been provided under methods (line 130). However, its limitation are still discussed under "Limitations" at the end of the article.

8. I have also provided a reference within the limitations section in relation to bias and self-esteem (line 568).

Reference no. 56: 56.

Marcus B, Schütz A. Who are the people reluctant to participate in research? Personality correlates of four different types of nonresponse as inferred from self-and observer ratings. Journal of personality. 2005; 73(4):959-84.