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Author’s response to reviews:

D1 Now T1D Young Adult Study
School of Medicine
National University of Ireland, Galway
Ireland

October 23, 2017

Dear Editors in Chief
RE: “Strength in Numbers: an international consensus conference to develop a novel approach to care delivery for young adults with type 1 diabetes, the D1 Now Study” (Ref: RIAE-D-17-00008)

Thank you for considering our paper for publication in Research Involvement and Engagement. We found both the editors’ and reviewers’ comments valuable and constructive and have addressed these in our revised submission.

I have submitted a new version of our paper with revisions. The changes that have been made in response to each of the points raised by the reviewers are outlined below. We have highlighted changes to text in red (using track changes) in the main text of the document and given the page number and paragraph where these occur.

We hope that we have addressed all comments adequately and that this revised version of our paper can be re-considered for publication in Research Involvement and Engagement.

On behalf of the authors,

Yours sincerely.

Professor Sean F. Dinneen
on behalf of the Irish D1 Now T1D Young Adult Study Group

Responses to Reviewer Comments

“Strength in Numbers: an international consensus conference to develop a novel approach to care delivery for young adults with type 1 diabetes, the D1 Now Study”

Authors have used tracked changes to insert new text, delete and edit existing text. These appear in red on version 2.0 of the manuscript. Direct response to reviewers comments are in red below.

RIAE-D-17-00008

Reviewer 1 Comments:

1. Accept, an article of importance in its field

No changes recommended.

Reviewer 2 Comments:
2. Accept, an article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

No changes recommended.

Reviewer 3 Comments:

3. The structure of the abstract and paper does not meet the recommended guidance of the journal, methods and results are reported separately in the criteria for preparing a manuscript for methodology papers.

The abstract has been amended to reflect the required structure for methodology papers, please see page 3.

4. The title and subheading 'Strength in numbers' may be misleading for the reader and they may expect a paper reporting the findings on the number of participants in the consensus conference to support a method as an approach.

Our conference was called “Strength In Numbers: Teaming up to improve the health of young adults with type 1 diabetes”. To ensure consistency to readers, researchers and delegates who attended this conference who are already familiar with our work we have not changed the title. However, we have now included the full conference name in the Plain English Summary (page 2), the abstract (page 3), in the Introduction (page 6) and in the Methods (page 7) so there is no confusion about what we are describing.

5. On line 8: "A list of all measures used in published interventions involving young adults with type 1 diabetes were compiled (n =87)". Further detail is required, how many published interventions and between what years were measures identified from?

This manuscript describing the COS process in detail is currently under review at Trials (Byrne M, O'Connell A, Egan AM, Dinneen SF, Hynes L, O'Hara MC, Holt RIG, Willaing I, Vallis M, Hendrieckx C and Coyne I. A Core Outcomes Set for clinical trials of interventions for young adults with type 1 diabetes: an international, multi-perspective Delphi consensus study. Ref: TRLS-D-17-00503). Until its publication, we would only like to describe the COS process more broadly in the context of the 3-day consensus conference. However, Dr Molly Byrne is who lead author of the COS paper (and is also an author of this paper under review at Research Involvement and Engagement) would like invite the interested reviewer to follow up separately and she would be happy to discuss the COS process and paper that is under review with them. Her contact details are as follows:

Dr Molly Byrne
6. You highlight the findings of development core outcome set are being published elsewhere on line 43. This is a large and interesting piece of work are you willing to share the 8 outcomes reaching consensus for COS inclusion if this does not conflict with other publishing guidelines?

The description of the COS process and outcomes are only very broadly described as the focus of this paper was more specifically on detailing the stakeholder-led consensus conference. For more information on the COS paper that is under review at Trials, please contact Dr Byrne (details provided above in Point 5).

7. More recent references for Delphi consensus approaches are available, authors include Hasson and Hsu. Further detail of the methods is required to allow the reader to understand the process better in order to reproduce methods and how this may have an advantage over different approaches. For example who identified the themes in the conference, what definition of consensus was used and how were challenges between different stakeholder groups managed.

We have now included the following references where the Delphi approach is mentioned on page 8:


Please see response above in Point 5, for more information on the COS paper that is under review at Trials, please contact Dr Byrne (details provided above in Point 5).

Reviewer 4 Comments:

8. On page 6 there is a paragraph discussing discrete choice experiment (DCE) methodology that I am sure readers would be interested to know more about, so I suggest 1-2 references about this methodology are provided.

An additional explanation of DCE is now provided on page 6 as are the following 2 references:


9. On page 6 a qualitative engagement study is discussed, but again not referenced for the reader to learn more.

This manuscript is currently being prepared for publication by co-author Dr Lisa Hynes but reader have now been alerted to this fact on page 6. If reviewers require more information, please contact Dr Hynes via email (lisa.hynes@mail.wvu.edu).

10. On pages 9-11 different roles are discussed to provide support for young people with type 1 diabetes - 'named supporter', 'youth worker' and 'key worker'. Can the authors say a little more about what these roles would entail and how they are different from each other?

As detailed in the paper, the Expert Panel were split into three different groups. Each group used a slightly different label for the type of person who would support and advocate for young adults but the attributes and competencies of this person they described in their different group had many similarities, e.g., this person should advocate for better access to services, they should actively reach out to young adults (in cases where the young person doesn’t attend their scheduled clinic appointment, it was suggested this person could go out to visit them), they should be a constant contact even when other things are changing such as making the transition from paediatric diabetes clinics to adult diabetes clinics. The words they used were slightly different but the roles and responsibilities of this person were similar across groups. The term ‘youth worker’ has now been used throughout the manuscript for consistency.

11. On page 15, second paragraph, there is a rather brief discussion of new and challenges to the research team from the approach adopted. Can more be said here, such as lessons to be learned, how they might have done things differently, things that went well etc. This will be of particular interest to research teams interested in adopting a similar process in their research.

This has now been explained in more detail, please see page 15.

12. Page 5, line 48, reference 9 - I don't think this is the correct reference, should it be 6?

Following this review process, additional references have been included in this paper. This systematic review is now reference 16, please see page 5.
13. Plain English Summary - typo line 18, policy makers (not markers)

This typo has now been corrected on page 2.

Additional Change

14. Better describing the Jigsaw Galway model used in forming this PPI panel

The Jigsaw Galway model, on which the formation of the PPI Young Adult Panel was based has been described in more detail on page 5 with the following references now included:


- Fitzmaurice J. Jigsaw overview of Galway’s system for promoting mental health in young people. Nursing in General Practice, 2012, Mental Health - Part 1:26-29