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Working towards a better understanding of type 2 diabetes care organization with First Nations communities: A Qualitative Assessment

Comments -

Abstract -

Is 'patient' the correct term to be used? - 'a person living with diabetes'?

The background section contains some methodological aspects. Furthermore, the aim of this study is not clear - need to clarify why you are doing this work?

Qualitative description is generally used to describe findings as it is (though some analysis is allowed) - Were findings described here directly from data collected or as a result of analysis? Could include some findings here?

The recommendations in conclusion - is the methodology used (qualitative description), a suitable method to make these conclusions? May need to justify.

Main text -

Background -

Review the use of non-academic terms (e.g. staggering); A thorough proofread by an academic proof-reader or editor could help.

The justification for this study - why is this study important? E.g. hasn't been done before, other similar publications are not comparable etc.

The aim of the study - what do you aim to learn from this exercise?
Methods –

Study design - why do you think qualitative description (QD) is suitable here? What conditions have been met to use such methodology? Was the study planned from the beginning to use QD?? Who were the targeted stakeholders and is QD a suitable method to describe their ideas?

Setting - the description of the electronic system could be done completely and comprehensively in the background section alone. Currently it is dispersed across the article. Justify further why the first 6 sites are an accurate representation of all sites. How did you estimate the number of persons living with diabetes? Identify and describe the included sites - population demographics, distances, services available, geographic and other limitations for health services access - probably a table.

Why wasn't the telephone group interview/s recorded - if detailed notes were taken, was shorthand used? Qualitative description is best suited to describe situations as they are. Could this be achieved by taking notes only? Justify.

Table 1 - how were the questions developed? Reviewed by whom? Stakeholders included? Pilot study? This table may be better suited as a supplement.

Data analysis - justify use of inductive analysis in QD? Usually inductive approaches are used for theory development? May need to explain the depth of analysis if qualitative description is used as the best option methodology for this study.

If telephone interviews were used, why not include other sites?

Justify the use of the 5R system for use in data extraction? Describe the contents of the 5R system (is it table 2?)

How were the interviews stored - data safety?

How were the interviews coded - a coding structure was used in further analysis?

Results -

Describe in methodology how service details of participants were obtained.

Lines 183-185 are probably as a result of analysis? - suited for later?

Is table 2 part of results - identified from stakeholder interviews? If not, more suited for the background/methodology section where the service is described?

Why were some of the 'R's' collapsed in reporting? Weren't the data collected according to the 5R framework?
Within each R, a sub heading for each section could be a better method of presenting data.

Was table 3 populated from data identified during telephone interviews? If yes, need to describe how this was done.

Lines 280 to 325 - where does it fall within the 5R matrix; a subheading (s) could help

Why weren't any direct quotations from stakeholders included (though not essential)?

Discussion -

Some sentences are similar to sentences in other sections - please revise

The strengths of the study has not been described.

Site specific issues in Indigenous studies: how can these affect the service model - you have mentioned briefly - could expand

Conclusion -

The description of the 6R service (re-imagining), could be in the discussion/or any other section. The conclusion is not very suitable to bring in new information.

General comment-

This is a qualitative study - data collected from some stakeholders of a new electronic health system. Throughout the study, comments made by stakeholders (direct quotes) were not found. Qualitative description is primarily for describing findings as they are - can include comments made by stakeholders - to expand-on findings or analysis (though not an absolute necessity).
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