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Reviewer's report:

• Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The Methods section of the main paper should indicate how many practices invited – it is only in the discussion that this is explained re all in the same association.

2. The Methods section of the main paper should include the sample size calculations.

3. The Methods section does not say anything about the usual care group (other than the number of their consultations in the Table) – suggest you add at least a basic description in text to highlight the difference in terms of number of consultation with GP and NP.

4. Methods section – was it random allocation of patients; was allocation practice based?

5. Results – was the effect of clustering taken into account?

6. Results – how many training and return meetings were involved for GPs and NPs?

7. Results – only data on the intervention group is provided in terms of participant satisfaction; if similar is available for the usual care group, it should be provided.

8. Discussion – new data is provided in this section, which is not in the Results section e.g. the participants outcomes of intervention compared to usual care group. These should be presented in the Results before discussion in the Discussion section.

9. Discussion – either here or in the Methods section, outline the (average) length of GP and NP consultations in both the intervention and usual care group (relevant to interpretation under the title ‘Professional level’).

10. Discussion - either here or in the Methods section, outline if there was a payment to practices (relevant to interpretation under the title ‘Organisational level’).

• Minor Essential Revisions

1. The Methods section of the abstract should contain some information on number of practices (or GPs and nurses) and patients participating.
2. If available, the Methods section of the main paper could provide a comparative basic description in text of the content or other of usual care.

3. Results – it is not clear what the phrase “preliminary withdraw” means.

4. Results – rephrase “Half of the participants indicated to have received proper guidance…” to “Half of the participants indicated they had received proper guidance…”

5. Discussion – rephrase “…appointments for the next visit were made at once during consultations” to “…appointments for the next visit were made before completing the current consultation”.

6. Discussion – rephrase “…reported a lack in nutritional knowledge” to “…reported a lack of nutritional knowledge”.

7. Discussion – rephrase “…disturbed glucose values were no prerequisite for participation” to “…disturbed glucose values were not a prerequisite for participation”.

8. Discussion – rephrase “Reasons for withdrawal did however not…” to “Reasons for withdrawal did not however …”

9. Conclusions – suggest you add “in the Netherlands” to the end of the first sentence.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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