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Dr. Olivier Bruyere
Co-Editor-in-Chief
Archives of Public Health

Re: (AOPH-D-19-00174R1) Working towards a better understanding of type 2 diabetes care organization with First Nations communities: A Qualitative Assessment

Dear Dr. Bruyere:

We are pleased to hear your decision to publish our manuscript in Archives of Public Health, as a “Research Article”, upon completion of corrections suggested by the reviewers. As per your instructions, we have responded to the reviewers’ comments point-by-point below and we have highlighted changes in the manuscript in yellow.

Reviewer #1 comments:

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for their time and effort revisiting our manuscript.

1. Writing style should ideally match the intended audience - a newspaper article (general public) versus a research article aimed at an academic audience.

2. Description of the electronic system - I still feel the dispersed nature of the service description makes it difficult to read - It is recommended that this is reviewed again.
3. (Originally Point #5) Similarity in sentences - I agree that key information may need repetition - however, it does not mean one needs to use the exact same sentence - changes recommended.

RESPONSE: We compiled and responded to points 1, 2, and 5 together because the comments relate to the writing style of the manuscript. To address Reviewer #1’s concerns, we had a professional editor review the manuscript and we made revisions on pg. 7, lines 141-142, pg 7, lines 146-151, and pg. 8, lines 168-169.

4. Since the sites were de-identified, I assumed some organisational sensitivity - hence storage of data and safety are important aspects.

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for the opportunity to strengthen the reporting of our study. To address this concern, we added the sentence: All data were kept on a secure server or in locked files in a secure office with privileged access with only the research team having access to the data (pg 8-9, lines 174-176).

5. 'Service details of participants' - participants' responsibilities in the organisation, responsibilities within the new system etc.- answered for reviewer 2.

RESPONSE: As the reviewer noted, we provided additional service details of participants in our previous revision based on Reviewer #2’s comment.

6. Aren't site specific issues (barriers/enablers) important when implementing the new service- especially when implementing in other sites in future?

RESPONSE: We agree with the reviewer that site-specific issues are important when implementing a new service. We will examine site-specific barriers and enablers to implementing RADAR in future studies. In the current study, we described the organization of diabetes care prior to implementing RADAR. For clarity, we have initialized the phrase, “prior to implementing RADAR” in the following sentence:

For this study, we aimed to qualitatively assess the organization of type 2 diabetes (T2D) care in participating First Nations communities at baseline prior to implementing RADAR as little is known about how T2D care is organized within the context of First Nations communities in Alberta (pg 6, lines 124-127).

Reviewer #2 comment:

1. A well written article.

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for their time and effort revisiting our manuscript.

We hope and trust that this revision is considered both responsive and satisfactory, and we thank you in advance for your further review of our work.
Respectfully submitted on behalf of all the co-authors,

Dean T. Eurich, PhD
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