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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript which describes a pilot study on the development of MY-DEMO in Malaysia.

Overall, the manuscript grammar needs to be improved. At present, there are a lot of grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. It should be sent to a copy editor to improve clarity. It can also be considerably shortened to make it more concise.

1. **Title:** This study is a pilot study, and describes the development of MY-DEMO. It does not describe any validation process. Therefore, the title should reflect this, and include words like a pilot study, and to remove the word validation as it may be misleading.

2. **Abstract** is not well written. It does not summarize the content of the manuscript well. The first line should state the background of the study. Instead, the authors have written the aim of the study instead, without a line or 2 of intro.

3. **Main manuscript:** The aim of the study – are the authors really evaluating diabetes education programmes? The implications of developing the MY-DEMO tool can be further strengthened. As such, its implications look weak and uninteresting.

4. Consider replacing the words Bahasa Malaysia to the Malay language to cater for international readers.

5. The authors have attempted to explain that diabetes in the Malay language (according to layman) is sweet urine, but does not explain why. Can this be elaborated further? How has the term sweet blood improved diabetes education?

6. **What 3 races?** What has “races” to do with the term sweet urine?

7. The authors mentioned that there is excess of delicious and cheap food in Malaysia. What does this imply? How about other factors contributing to diabetes? Like being unaware of healthy lifestyle changes? Hence, it does not mean that a surplus of good food in Malaysia will lead to diabetes.

8. Why is repetitive prayer movement linked with physical activities?

9. **Delivery of MY-DEMO:** What different formats were used by the researcher to deliver education? Please elaborate

10. Research tools: Who did the panel of experts and non-experts consist of?
11. How were the questions ranked in difficulty? Describe the process. Since this is the core of the manuscript, this section should be described in detail.

12. How was face and content validity performed? On how many subjects?

13. Study sample: suggest that the authors rewrite the para on how sample size was calculated. Although all the points for sample size calculation was there, it can be improved.

14. The authors mentioned that subjects were recruited from 2 sites, and that emails were sent to inform them of the MY-DEMO talk. What was the response rate? How many were approached, how many turned up for the talk?

15. Results: Para 3.1 is repetitive. Only highlight significant results. Otherwise, refer readers to Table 1. The authors should list the items of MY-DEMO (i.e. write the full sentences as how the subjects read it). Do not use abbreviations in the title. (e.g. HBM)

16. Table 2 and 3 can be combined

17. Table 2: do not need to state the obvious – i.e. correct AND incorrect answers. Since the authors have already calculated the percentage, and there is no negative marking, subjects either answered it correctly or incorrectly. Just state no. of subjects that answered correct and %. State n=? in the pre and post test, and tables should be further defined that figures mean n(%)

18. Discussion: First para should summarize the important findings. Results should then be discussed, and compared with literature according to the sequence presented in the results section. Instead the authors discussed a lot of theory without reference to their results in the first few paras. The discussion section is also extremely lengthy. It should be shortened to only include relevant points of discussion.

19. Conclusion: needs to be stated that this is a pilot study, and provides only preliminary results. Hence, the authors need to be a little more cautious in their conclusions.

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

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

No to all