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Reviewer’s report:

General
This paper clearly describes the effects of a lifestyle intervention program among subjects with moderate to high risk on diabetes mellitus. The program has been tested before in Finland and the present study investigates its feasibility and effect in an Australian primary care setting. The authors conclude that it is feasible to implement the program in this setting and that the effects are similar to those observed in clinical trials.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Although the authors are cautious in interpreting the results I think that it may be premature to suggest that the effects are similar to previous studies because this study lacks a control group. The consequence of not having a control group should be discussed in the discussion section, because there is a large risk that the results are not the consequence of the program itself but of being involved in a research setting. In a previous intervention study carried out in the primary care setting this effect was clearly demonstrated (EM van Sluijs et al, 2005)

Furthermore, the authors describe the costs of the intervention. I would suggest to differentiate between the various costs, so the reader gets more insight into it. In the discussion the authors compare cost per lifestyle and drug intervention and conclude that lifestyle interventions can be carried out at reasonable costs, suggesting that it may be more worthwhile to invest in lifestyle interventions. However to really compare costs, it should be compared with the (long term) effects. Since we should be careful in interpreting the effects of this study I believe the authors should also be careful in comparing the costs.

The authors do refer to previous papers in which the program is described, but I would prefer to have more information in the paper (content of program, intensity etc.), because only in the discussion section it became clear that the intensity of the program was highest in the first 3 months.

Furthermore, I believe the english language can be improved.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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