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Reviewer’s report:

Translating proven diabetes prevention programs is of paramount public health importance. I applaud the researchers for seeking to address this in such a high need environment. However, this manuscript has some major issues, which need to be addressed before publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions
- The Background section jumps around a lot, making it very difficult to follow the authors’ arguments justifying the study.
- I was unsure after reading the background of the focus of this study – is it diabetes? Or metabolic syndrome? Cardiovascular risk factors? This section needs more focus.
- The authors barely discuss other church-based interventions. How does this trial add to the existing data?
- The authors provide no discussion about either of the programs they are translating. What are the designs of the original programs and what components will you use? Also, please provide some scientific justification for using a diabetes prevention program here. The focus of the DPS was not on reducing hypertension. I am not sure about the PREMIER trial design and the authors never described it.
- The Methods/Design section is likewise very repetitive. Please reorganize this section to avoid repeating information.
- I think you are planning to enroll individuals with EITHER prediabetes or prehypertension, but the way it was described in the manuscript was sometimes unclear.
- Table 1 should either be made into a figure or made into a proper table with row/column headings.
- The quality assurance section is very vague. Please provide more details. For example, what measures will be used to ensure that diabetes risk screening is delivered as intended? How will you assess and assure fidelity of the intervention delivery between sites?
- The measures sections should be written as text or put in a table. Also, please provide a better description of methods to be used. Many are vague or not
present (for example, there is no section on laboratory methods).
- Your intervention evaluation should mirror the aims of the study.
- The discussion is really weak. How does this trial compare to other studies? What are the potential impacts?

Minor Essential Revisions
- Throughout the manuscript, the authors switch between past, present and future tenses when describing the study. Please correct.
- Under Step II, you have a typo. Please change “Fasten” to fasting.

Discretionary Revisions
None

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests.