

Dear editors and Reviewers:

We would like to thank the reviewers for their comments concerning about our manuscript entitled “What are the self-management experiences of elderly people with diabetes? A systematic review of qualitative research” (ID:69821).

The comments are valuable and very helpful. We have amended the relevant part of the manuscript, and the revised portions are marked in red in the manuscript. The responses to the reviewer’s comments are as follows:

1. Citations not used adequately

Responses:

Thank you for your comment. We have added some new references:

(1) **Lin, X.**, Xu, Y., Pan, X., Xu, J., Ding, Y., Sun, X., ... & Shan, P. F. (2020).

Global, regional, and national burden and trend of diabetes in 195 countries and territories: an analysis from 1990 to 2025. *Scientific reports*, 10(1), 1-11.

[PMID: 32901098 DOI: 10.1038/s41598-020-71908-9]

(2) **Tong, A.**, Flemming, K., McInnes, E., Oliver, S., & Craig, J. (2012).

Enhancing transparency in reporting the synthesis of qualitative research: ENTREQ. *BMC medical research methodology*, 12(1), 1-8. [PMID: 23185978

DOI: 10.1186/1471-2288-12-181]

(3) **Moher, D.**, Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Prisma Group. (2009).

Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS medicine*, 6(7), e1000097. [PMID: 19621072 DOI:

10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097]

(4) **CASP.** Critical Appraisal Skills Programme UK. <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>(accessed on September 20, 2021).

2. Inappropriate Prisma statement cited

(5) Responses: We have changed the citation to “**Moher, D.**, Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Prisma Group. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS medicine, 6(7), e1000097. [PMID: 19621072 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097]”

3. Why database search included the specific dates mentioned in the manuscript? What about studies published beyond this timeline? It's a key limitation.

Responses: we repeated the search and the search time span was from inception until September 20, 2021. No new citations met the inclusion criteria. In addition, the data in Figure 1 have been corrected.

4. Very difficult to understand what authors mean by 'Reference chaining and hand searching for relevant empirical articles stopped when electronic searches were completed.

Responses: We apologize for our incorrect writing. The statement has been corrected as follows: “Reference lists of the review and included studies were hand-searched for relevant additional empirical articles after electronic searches were completed.”

5. The exact date of the last date of search is needed.

Responses: We apologize for our negligence regarding this mistake. We have

added the date as “on September 20, 2021.”

6. inclusion criteria should not state search strategy.

Responses: We apologize for the inappropriate description. We have removed the search strategy from the inclusion criteria.

7. It is not clear what is 'context' in the inclusion criteria? The inclusion and exclusion criteria should ideally be in text rather than in a table.

Responses: We have rewritten the inclusion criteria as follows: 1) All qualitative papers about the experiences and needs of elderly people with diabetes and their perspectives and attitudes toward self-management of diabetes were included. No limitation in the type of qualitative research was placed. 2) The participants had been diagnosed with diabetes, and the focus was on self-management or self-care in individuals aged over 60. 3) published in English and Chinese. The exclusion criteria as follows: 1) Papers were not qualitative methodologies. Primary empirical papers that had not focused on the experience, perception, perspective and attitudes toward self-management of older people with diabetes. Secondary evidence (any type of review) were also excluded. 2) The participants do not have diabetes. Papers not focus on self-management or self-care in individuals aged over 60. 3) Published not in English and Chinese.

8. Study population requires to be more legitimately described. The presented form is an oversimplified version.

Responses: We agree to the suggestion that the manner by which the population is presented is oversimplified. Hence, we have made the following change: “the participants had been diagnosed with diabetes, and thus the focus was on self-management or self-care in individuals aged over 60 years.”

9. The definition of elder people remains unclear in the inclusion criteria. Is 60

the cut-off of elderly people across the globe? Did authors investigate it?

Responses: The definition of old people varied among different countries. US CDC defines elder people as 65 or older. WHO and Law of the People's Republic of China on the Protection of The Rights and Interests of the Elderly define elder people as 60 or older. In this manuscript, we included individuals aged 60 or older.

10. There are English language issues despite use of English language editing services.

Responses: We have asked a native speaker to proofread the manuscript.

11. Figure no. is not stated in the figure legend. Figure legend not adequately used.

Responses: We are sorry for the mistake, and we have stated the number in the figure legend.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

Reviewer #2

(1) Authors are wellcome to discuss how they confront "Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations" (<https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/>) and "Enhancing transparency in reporting the synthesis of qualitative research: ENTREQ" (<https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/entreq/>) in their manuscript.

Responses: Thank you for your useful advice. The ENTREQ statement can help researchers report the stages that are most commonly associated with the synthesis of qualitative health research, ensuring the transparency of reporting of all the stages of the review process. Then, we have rewritten the manuscript according to the ENTREQ research guidelines.

(2) Databases used for data retrieval were accessed about a year ago. Do the authors wish to update their search? If not, can they explain their decision?

Responses: We reran the search on September 20, 2021 and update the PRISMA, there is no new research included.

(3) How did the authors search for gray literature?

We hand-searched gray literature in Google, Google Scholar, electronic online services, INVOLVE, Index to Theses, conference proceedings, and government sites.

(4) Why did the authors select only English and Chinese publications, thus excluding e.g. publications in German, French, Spanish etc? Can they explain their approach?

Owing to language restriction, only English and Chinese publications were included. Some relevant articles written in other languages might have been overlooked, and this point is a limitation of this study.