8th may 2012

The project Manager

Health SA Gesonheid

**RE: Submission 614 revision details**

The following were the changes made to article 614 based on suggestions by the reviewers and/or additional insight from the authors. We used sections rather than sentence numbers due to shifts that occur when text is transferred from one computer to another.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sub-section** | **Specific section** | **Changes made** | **Reasons for change** |
| Abstract(English) | Key word  | Word was put in bold font | Reviewer recommendation |
|  | **Results**:-first sentence | letter D bold font was removed, self-reported was added | “ |
|  | -4th sentence | diet was added | “ |
|  | Conclusion:-2nd sentence | Accepted deletion of ‘the’ and addition of ‘a’ | “ |
| Afrikaans | **Background**:-last sentence | Added missing sentence | “ |
|  | **Aim**:-First sentence | Deleted and added recommended word | “ |
|  | **Results**:-First line | Accepted addition of “self-reported” | “ |
|  | **Conclusion:**-last sentence | Accepted change to sentence construction | “ |
| Introduction | First line | Added “background sub-title” |  |
|  | Second paragraph-2nd line | Added two authors | Follow reference guidelines |
|  | Third paragraph | Added the Sub-section on patient education | Better link and flow of information |
| Problem statement | First line | Accepted change of though to “although” | Reviewer recommendation |
|  | Fourth line | Added a noun “problem” | To make sentence clear |
|  | Second paragraph:-1st and 4th line | Accepted reviewer recommended changes |  |
| Aim & objectives | 4th line | Accepted addition of “self-reported” |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Education needs assessment | Whole section | Moved the to the introduction and removed the sub-title | Part of background to the study |
|  | 1st line | Added “diabetes” | Make information more study specific as per reviewer advice |
|  | 3rd line | Added a sentence | Additional support for the needs assessment |
|  | Paragraph 2:-1st line  | Deleted focus group | Intended to support “why” qualitative study, then narrow to Focus groups |
|  | -4th line | Added ‘in particular’ | Narrow to focus groups |
| Definition of concepts | After needs | Added the definition of DSME | Make the background more clear |
| Significance of the study | Whole section | Moved from original location to after aims & objectives and tense used changed | More logical flow as per reviewer suggestion |
| Materials | Title | Changed to “population & sampling” | More suitable as humans were used, to incorporate reviewer suggestion for recruitment procedures be included in this section |
|  | 1st paragraph | Additional information on inclusion criteria for patients,’ why’ the patient age group’, and where the health professionals (HP) were from. | Address issue in editors report |
|  | 2nd paragraph | Added details on recruitment and the total eligible Health Professionals | Address issue raised by reviewer |
| Data collection | Paragraph 1-2nd line -Last sentence | Deleted last part of 3rd sentence Deleted referenceChanged ‘primary researcher’ to principal investigator’ | Agreed with reviewer recommendation |
|  | Paragraph 2-line 1-line 3-line 4 | Deleted ‘one of each’ added ‘each’Added total number of focus group and patientsAdded the research members, replaced ‘members’ with ‘team’  | Reviewer recommendation“ |
|  | Paragraph 3-line 1-2-line 3 | Added number of questions in the questionnairesIncluded areas that the questions addressed | Reviewer recommendation |
| Data analysis | Paragraph 2-4th line | Added the principal investigator  | Reviewer recommendation |
| Context of the study | Whole section4th line | Moved to the section after the design and renamed settingAdditional information on the background on patient education at the CHCs | Deemed to better set the scene for the participants background than when it comes after  |
| Trustworthiness | Title-2nd line | Spelling correctedChanged from ‘multiple methods’ to using different participants to generate” | Address issue of multiple methods raised by reviewer’ |
| Ethical considerations | -1st section, potential benefits & harm, informed consent and data protection  | Moved to after methodology and before the results  | Agree with reviewer recommendation to ease flow of readability |
|  | -Recruitment procedures-1st line-2nd line from ‘participation’ | Incorporated in the population & sampling section-Incorporated in the informed consent | Reviewer recommendationReviewer recommendation |
|  | -Informed consent | Added last sentence |  |
| Results: biographic description | 2nd line | Accepted position change for word ‘patients’ | Reviewer recommendation |
| Results: understanding of diabetes & its treatment | -Title-1st line | Accepted use of abbreviation for diabetes mellitusAdded sentence to indicate type of questions asked | Reviewer recommendationReviewer recommendation |
| Table 1 | Education level | Accepted change of St to Std |  |
| Results: understanding of diet & adherence | -3rd line | -Included the reference dietary guidelines -Removed the aspect of fibre and discussed it later-added statements from participants | Reviewer recommendationSupport that they were aware of dietary recommendations |
|  | Paragraph 3 | -Changed the sentence to reflect participants comments-added an extra participant comment | Address reviewer query |
|  | Paragraph 5 | Added more participants’ comment | To support problem was not seen in only one participant  |
|  | Paragraph 6-From 2nd sentence to the last | -Restructured sentences -added information to show the problem of balanced meal, and foods not frequently consumed-added additional participants comments | To better convey the problem with dietary intake in terms of food groupsTo address issue raised by reviewer |
|  | Paragraph | Issue on fibre addressed separately | Reviewer recommendation |
|  | Paragraph 7 | Added information on the kind of questions the health professionals were asked | To address issue raised by reviewer |
| Results: barriers to adhere to dietary recommendations | -1st line | Added a statement to show the kind of questions that were asked | Reviewer recommendation |
|  | -paragraph 5: 3rd line | Accepted sentence restructuring | Reviewer recommendation |
| Table 4 | Self care and adherence | Removed ‘cravings & temptations sub-category-ethnographic description moved to ceremonies sub-category | Agree with reviewer recommendation |
|  | Structural/environmental | Added two statements by health professionals to show that lack of water hindered gardening | To address issue raised by reviewer |
|  | Misconception/poor understanding of disease | Misconception deleted as it was already identified under understanding of DM & its treatment | To address issue raised by reviewer |
| **Results**: facilitators to following dietary recommendations | 1st line | Added a paragraph to show the kind of questions participants were asked | Reviewer recommendation |
| **Results**: recommendations for a NE programme | 1st line | Added a paragraph to show the kind of questions participants were asked | Reviewer recommendation |
|  | Paragraph 4: last sentence | Restructured sentence and added extra information  | Make it clear and hence address issue raised by reviewer |
| Trustworthiness | -Title  | Corrected title spelling |  |
|  | -1st sentence | Multiple methods of data collection, changed to different type of participants | To address issue raised by reviewer |
|  | -Whole section | Moved whole section to after data analysis | Better link with the data collection and analysis |
| **Discussion**: outline of results | Paragraph 2, 2nd sentence | Added self-reported | Agreed with reviewer recommendation |
| **Discussion**: Knowledge about DM & treatment; | 10th line | Restructured last part of sentence | Agreed with reviewer recommendation |
| **Discussion**: diet knowledge, dietary practices & adherence | -paragraph 1, 3rd line-paragraph1, 10th line-paragraph 3, 2nd line | Added the reference dietary recommendationsReplaced intake with practicesAdded ‘countries’ after developed | Reviewer recommendationReviewer recommendation |
| **Discussion**:Barriers & facilitators | -Title-Paragraph 1;1st line, 2nd sentence-Paragraph 1; last Sentence | Replace following with adhereRejected the deletion of “they”Replace word ‘issue’ with ‘barrier’ | Reviewer recommendationThe first sentence was in the plural, so we felt the following should also be“ |
|  | -Paragraph 2, 1st line-Paragraph 2, 4th line | Replaced access with accessibilityAddressed issue raised by reviewer in the results section | “ |
|  | After paragraph 3 | Added a sentence to indicate family was seen both as a facilitator & barrier | Reviewer recommendationto address the issue |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation for a NE programme | Paragraph 6, last sentence | Sentence restructured by not discarded as suggested by reviewer | Authors felt it better explained the finding was seen in other type 2 patients |
| Strengths & limitations | Paragraph 3, third line | Added et al. to reference ‘Babbie’ | Observe reference recommendations |
| Conclusion & recommendations | -2nd sentence, paragraph 1-6th line, paragraph 1 | Restructured sentenceAddressed reviewer issue on ‘family as both a facilitator & barrier in the discussion | Reviewer recommendation“ |
|  | Paragraph 2 | Deleted, last part put as last sentence in paragraph 1 | “ |
|  | Paragraph 3, 1st line | Replaced ‘intake with ‘practice’ | “ |
| References | Anderson-Loftin et alBabbie et al.Page 32Page 33Page 35Page 29Page 31Page 33 | Deleted year in wrong positionCorrected second author spellingCorrected spellings for ‘Norlyk, second author & Nthangeni, last authorDeleted Sicree & ShawDeleted Willis & LopezAdded an extra reference; “Department of Health”Added two extra reference (IDF)Added reference “Suhl & Bonsignore | Reference used for the dietary reference usedUsed in the text during the revision of articleNot used in the textAuthors already in the reference list but in this one, order of names had been interchanged |

Sincerely
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