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ABSTRACT

Minor Essential Revision – Re-word the last sentence in the background to: ‘The focus of this study is the SLIM (Study on Lifestyle intervention and Impaired glucose tolerance Maastricht) diabetes prevention intervention. This study objective is to examine the adaptation of the SLIM diabetes research intervention to a real-life setting.’

Minor Essential Revision – Re-word the first sentence of the methods to: ‘Three adaptation setps were used, following current adaptation frameworks. Participants included study intervention developers and local health care professionals (n = 19).’

Minor Essential Revision – Change ‘a total of 16 participants’ to ‘There were 16 participants, X healthcare professionals, X study intervention developers, and X health promotion expert’.

Minor Essential Revision – In your abstract methods, you state there were 3 steps. In the abstract report on each step. E.g., There were 22 elements identified, twelve of which were found to be applicable in the real-life setting. The adaptations made for the inapplicable elements included: ….’

INTRODUCTION

Major Essential Revision – I think the length of the introduction is too long.

Minor Essential Revision – move your study objective statement to the end of the introduction.

Minor Essential Revision – Remove the first line of the highlighted paragraph on page 6. You shouldn’t discuss that your study adds to current knowledge before presenting the methods and results of your study.

METHODS

Minor Essential Revision – Under participants, state that this study is approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of Wageningen University. You should also state if informed written consent was obtained.

Minor Essential Revision – 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.

RESULTS
Minor Essential Revision – The participation rates for each participation type by study step should be put into a table; it would be easier to digest that way. I think that would be more useful than the information you have in Table 2 on numbers of healthcare providers in each group in your location. For example, for the GPs, do you think they’re type of organization would make an impact on using the intervention in their setting? If not, this information can be briefly summarized in one line, as you already have.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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