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Dear Editor,

We would like to thank you for accepting our manuscript, with minor amendments. We responded to your concerns point-by-point. We hope the amendments made are sufficient.

If you would accept our manuscript for publication, would you kindly let me know when the manuscript will appear on the internet? We would like to distribute a press-release in the Netherlands about this manuscript.

Title: Effect of lifestyle intervention for diabetics and prediabetics in real-world primary care: propensity score analysis.
Joris J Linmans, Mark G Spigt, Linda Deneer, Annelies EM Lucas, Marlies de Bakker, Luc G Gidding, Rik Linssen and J André Knottnerus

Point-by-point response

Editor's comment:

- Regarding the title - we would prefer to use 'Effect of lifestyle intervention for people with diabetes and impaired glucose tolerance in 'real world' primary care: propensity score analysis.' and to change reference to '(pre)/diabetics' within the text to 'people with (pre-)diabetes'.

Response:
Patients with prediabetes can either have impaired fasting glucose or impaired glucose tolerance. Therefore, we feel that changing the title into 'Effect of lifestyle intervention for people with diabetes and impaired glucose tolerance in 'real world' primary care: propensity score analysis.' would not be fully appropriate.

Therefore we suggest changing the title into:
- 'Effect of lifestyle intervention for people with diabetes or prediabetes in 'real-world' primary care: propensity score analysis.' (current title)

We changed the use of (pre-)diabetics within the text into patients with (pre-)diabetes.

- I would also ask for clarification in the results section of the abstract - 'There was no significant difference in any outcome measure between either group (- was this at baseline or follow-up, or both?). The reduction of HbA1c and fasting glucose was positive, although not statistically significant (-0.12%, P=0.07 and -0.17 mmol/l, P=0.08 respectively). (- you need to clarify that the 'reduction' refers to the observation of a difference, though not statistically significant, between the groups at one year follow-up). (note also need commas changed to full stops for decimal values).
Response:
We added information in the Abstract section/Results to clarify that differences were at follow-up and compared with controls. We changed the commas where necessary in the whole manuscript into full stops.

- Regarding methods, can you clarify how you dealt with data 7-12 months, in comparison to 1 year (ie for Table 3 did you include 12 month outcomes for some patients, rather than omit these cases if earlier data were not available?
  Response:
  We added extra information in the Methods section/statistical analyses (page 9) to clarify that for this analysis, we only used data of the last six months of the follow-up period of one year, without using data from the first six months.

- Your statement in the results section 'The positive trend effect of the intervention on HbA1c observed during the first year, was not observed during the last six months of the intervention (p=0.26).’ requires some explanation - examination of the tables suggests to me that it was, since HbA1c was lower than baseline in both tables?
  Response:
  We agree and to clarify this, we changed the Results section (paragraph 3, page 11).

- Also, you have indicated that analysis was by t test - for all variables? I note your response to the reviewer who commented on the inappropriateness of this for exercise outcome which was categorical and would be more appropriately analysed using Chi square. A brief comment regarding this could be included, and perhaps a suggestion that the results suggest a decrease in activity over time?
  Response:
  We added extra information in the Methods section/statistical analyses (page 10) to clarify this. We also added a line in the Results section about the decrease in activity (page 11).

- Regarding the tables, there need to be consistency in the use of ‘matched’ and ‘adjusted’ - otherwise this is confusing.
  Response:
  We agree that there is a difference between adjusting and matching and that we used these terms inconsistently. Therefore, we changed both tables to clarify that the adjusted effects are the effects after the matching procedure.

- Please also add Standard Deviations of means to Tables 2 and 3.
  Response:
We added Standard Deviations of the means to tables 2 and 3. Note that most of the means have changed slightly. This is due to the fact that previously all variables were combined into one model excluding all cases with missing values on either variable. This model did not provide SD for baseline and follow-up measurements. Therefore, we recalculated the means and SD for each outcome variable separately. Cases with missings on other variables were not excluded in this scenario. The matching procedure and therefore the adjusted effects were unchanged.

- I feel the table titles would more accurately be stated as '...effects........compared with the control condition AT one year follow-up' for Table 2 and using 'at' instead of 'during' in Table 3.
  
  Response:
  We changed the titles of tables 2 and 3.

Editorial requirements:
- Please note incorrect use of 'is' and 'are' in places (eg Inactive lifestyle and obesity is'.
  
  Response:
  Please see the amendments in the manuscript.

- Also note that correct reference to 'data' should be plural - ie 'data are/were' not 'is/was'.
  
  Response:
  Please see the amendments in the manuscript.

- Please also change 'diabetics and prediabetics' to 'people with diabetes and pre-diabetes'.
  
  Response:
  Please see the amendments in the manuscript. Please also see the response to the first comment of the editor.

- Tables: Please note that we are unable to display vertical lines or text within tables, no display merged cells: please re-layout your table without these elements. Tables should be formatted using the Table tool in your word processor. Please ensure the table title is above the table and the legend is below the table. For more information, see the instructions for authors on the journal website.
  
  Response:
  We believe that we made the tables using the Table tool, without merging cells. We also placed the title above the table and the legend below the table already. Therefore, we are not sure how to change the tables regarding the comments above. If there are amendments to be made, please let us know and we will make them.

Reviewer's report:
• No further comments

Also on behalf of the other authors,
Yours sincerely,

Joris Linmans, MD
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