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Dear editor,

Thank you for the constructive re-review of our manuscript entitled: ‘Adapting the SLIM diabetes prevention intervention to a Dutch real-life setting: joint decision making by science and practice’. We are happy with the positive feedback.

We have now made the last minor revisions on your request. Below we provide detailed answers to your remarks.

Enclosed, please find the complete revised version of our manuscript. We look forward to the acceptance for publication.

With kinds regards,

On behalf of the authors
Sophia C Jansen
Editor's Comments:

The following should be revised by the authors before accepting the manuscript for publication.

ABSTRACT

Minor Essential Revision - Re-word the last sentence of the methods to:
Participants included study intervention developers and local health care professionals (n = 19).

Answer/revision: we re-worded the last sentence of the methods as suggested.

NB: We also slightly reworded the results. We now report on each adaptation step, as suggested by reviewer Jan Jensen (not required by the editor).

METHODS

Minor Essential Revision - State what ethical approval was obtained for the study.

Answer/revision: on page 7, first paragraph we added the following sentence: For this study, we obtained ethical approval of the Medical Ethical Committee of Wageningen University.

Minor Essential Revision - Clarify how was data collected? Did someone take notes or were the sessions recorded? Somehow it must have been recorded who judged an element as applicable. Add a sub-section on data collection, or if it differs in the three steps, add information to describe how data was collected and analyzed/organized in each step. This is where you should also mention that a combination of focus groups and email correspondence was used.

Answer/revision: Indeed data collection differed in the three steps, therefore we added the following information:

- Methods (general), Page 7 first paragraph, the following sentence was added: Data were collected by a combination of desk research, focus groups and (e)mail correspondence.

- Step 1, end of Page 8 and top of Page 9 (the grey lines were added): In the first step, the intervention elements of SLIM were identified. There is no clear definition of an intervention ‘element’ (or component) in the literature. For the scope of this article we defined ‘element’ as ‘a characteristic of an intervention which defines its nature, categorised into target population, techniques and instruments, intensity, delivery mode, materials, organisational structure, and political and financial conditions’, based on a combination of existing literature [7,15,18]. In order to identify SLIM elements, the SLIM archive was analysed. It contained research protocols, participant brochures and scientific articles from the period 1999 to present. All the documents were studied in order to obtain a detailed overview of the SLIM intervention. Knowledge gaps were filled in by the SLIM developers during semi-structured interviews where notes were taken. Afterwards, the information on the entire SLIM intervention was structured according to the categories of elements presented above. The separate SLIM elements in each category were identified and described.

- Step 2, Page 9 second paragraph, the following sentence was added: During this step, data were collected as written comments via post and e-mail. When necessary, additional information was collected through telephone contact. In the analysis, an intervention element was qualified as inapplicable when at least one person judged the element as inapplicable.

- Step 3, end of page 9 and top of page 10: We feel that in this step the data collection and analysis is already adequately described as a result of the last major revisions made, see current text: The focus groups were guided by a trained discussion leader and structured with a topic list. The basic questions in the focus groups were: Are the proposed adaptations feasible in your opinion? Can you implement this intervention in practice? Any objections were discussed until consensus was reached. Afterwards,
important discussion points were judged by two people based on their consequences for the adaptation of SLIM. Finally, the adaptations were incorporated in the new SLIMMER manual, a reference for health care professionals which was adapted as a result of this study.

RESULTS
Minor Essential Revision - The numbers for each participant type by study step should be included table 2.
**Answer/revision:** we rescheduled Table 2; we now provide the requested numbers instead of the original information (on numbers of health care providers in our local setting), in accordance with the suggestion of Jan L. Jensen.

**TABLE 2.** Number of participant type by adaptation step. N.a., not applicable (participant type not invited).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Type</th>
<th>Panel (n)</th>
<th>Step 1 (n)</th>
<th>Step 2 (n)</th>
<th>Step 3 (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention developers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health promotion expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General practitioner/ practice nurse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietician</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPY EDITING
After reading through your manuscript, we feel that the quality of written English needs to be improved before the manuscript can be considered further. We advise you to seek the assistance of a fluent English speaking colleague, or to have a professional editing service correct your language. Please ensure that particular attention is paid to the abstract.
**Answer/revision:** we had the language edited by a native-English speaker with scientific expertise, as suggested.