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General
The manuscript addresses a relevant issue, both scientifically and from the perspective of public health and clinical practice, also beyond the British context. Increase of both diabetes type 2 as a disease and increase of screening possibilities and offers, make this contribution important. This manuscript covers issues related to feasibility, uptake and psychological reactions to diabetes screening invitation, as a part of a larger and already published trial results. As a relatively small study this paper can however point out interesting issues more than solve big scientific questions. All in all, both the research questions and the whole manuscript is well formulated and written.

1. The methods seem to be appropriate, though a small selection of them has been used: e.g. only state anxiety measure instead of both state and trait anxiety measures.

2. Further, neither own perceived risk/susceptibility, nor knowledge of diabetes and/or diabetes risks is asked. On the other hand, a well-known measure of illness perceptions (although an older version) has been used.

3. The methods are in general well described, both in general and as instruments in this study. However, the implications of the very low Cronbach’s alpha of some sub-scales could be discussed in more detail than now.

4. The data seem to be sound, although group sizes are rather small to really bring in results with wider practical implications.

5. The manuscript refers to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition. The authors also generally acknowledge the published work on the association between anxiety and screening upon which they are building on. On the other hand, hardly any references are given comparing own results with the previous literature when discussing attenders vs non-attenders, and the feasibility and acceptance of the screening programme.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None.

Minor Essential Revisions
6. The implications of the very low Cronbach's alpha of some psychological sub-scales could be a) presented in more detail, and b) also discussed in more detail than now. The low alphas also are the central limitations of the study, especially when e.g. the treatment control sub-scale seemed to have the lowest internal consistency, and at the same time was one of the scales showing significant difference between the attenders and non-attenders.

7. The statistics part on page 6 states that linear regression was used. However, the results section presents only descriptive tests comparing between group differences of means.

8. Proper references could be given comparing own results with the previous literature when discussing attenders vs non-attenders, as well as the feasibility and acceptance of the screening programme.

Discretionary Revisions

9. One of the abstract sub-titles says: 'Introduction', but the text underneath seems to list the aims of the study. Otherwise I found the article title and the abstract relevant and informative.

10. In a couple of places the authors claim that 'the groups differed, though not statistically significantly'. If the difference was not statistically significant, it is better to say directly that 'no statistical difference was found'.

11. Otherwise the discussion and conclusion are balanced and supported by the data – with one exception: the conclusion might emphasize that the follow-up was rather short.

12. Is there a journal 'Health and Psychology', like the authors write on page 8? Do the authors potentially mean 'Psychology and Health'?

13. A minor issue: the authors use the term 'health promotion' in a slightly misleading way, e.g. twice on page 11. Perhaps they mean specifically 'diabetes prevention'? Health promotion means more structural, society or community level process to empower people to take care of their own health.
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