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**Reviewer's report:**

Authors have made considerable revision in this revised manuscript, which accomplish marked improvement in comprehensiveness of it. Especially, additional tables and appended checklist will help readers to interpret the meanings of this study.

However, there are still some drawbacks which authors should consider the revision before publication.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

Table2A had been constructed in complicated manner. Relationship between Topics Measured and Results was unclear, since each of them is shown in single cell. Topics Measured and Results should be shown in row-by-row.

There is several discrepancy in description between table 2A and manuscript body. Authors should check carefully the concordance between table and manuscript body. Below are some examples of discrepancy:

1. The order of description: Participants' engagement is shown in the last part of Fidelity of Intervention in manuscript body(p10) while it shown in the second part of Fidelity in table.
2. For results of Acceptability (p12), authors state the results of “usefulness” of each module, while “appreciation” is shown in Table2A. Moreover, “Development of diabetes” module is not shown in the table.
3. Values of evaluation of information and clarity are discordant: 3.3±0.6 in manuscript, while 3.4±0.5 in table.
4. Scoring method is not shown or discordant. For example, appreciation values “1.5” means “totally disagree to the appreciativeness of manual” according to table.

**Minor essential revision**

1. Abstract
   Results “DiAlert was positively evaluated.” What of DiAlert was evaluated?

2. Background
   P4L5: Write down exact words for the first appeared abbreviation, “MRC”.

3. Measures: Acceptability
“The evaluation form asked…to rate each module…” Rate what?

4. Data analysis
Misleading sentences “Pre- post comparison… … for overweight” should be revised as following:
Pre-post comparisons of changes in the determinants of behavioural change were conducted in obese subjects using paired-samples t-test or Wilcoxon test.

5. Results: Participants Characteristics
“In total, 22 people signed up for DiAlert and…“ This study is DiAlert Pilot Study.

6. Results: Acceptability
The last 2 sentences were the result of “Feasibility”

7. Results: Determinants of behavioural change
The sentence in P13L5-7 “Because the main…only (N=16)” should be transferred to the beginning of this section.

8. Results: Determinants of behavioural change
The last two paragraphs involve the interpretation of results, which should be mentioned in discussion section.

9. Discussion
P14, The meaning of the sentence “Group composition obviously is … context” is unclear.

10. Discussion: Lessons learned from this pilot
The second lesson shown by authors is not Lesson, but mere excuse for the limitation of this pilot study.

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.
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