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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting mixed method pilot study lifestyle intervention delivered by practice nurses for people with pre-diabetes in New Zealand primary care.

There are a number of problems with the trial which need to be more fully discussed and the conclusions adjusted accordingly:-

1. The design was not randomised - with control practices from a neighbouring provincial city.

2. The trial was registered in August 2015 well after the conclusion of patient recruitment in April 2015.

3. The study was powered to show an 4kg weight loss equivalent to 5% of weight - a minimal clinically significant loss at 6 months. However only a mean 1.3kg weight loss was demonstrated with non significant changes in Hb1c.

4. In table 3 it is unclear what statistical test was performed to compare change in intervention and controls.

5. The retention rate of 79% was reasonable. Further there was evidence provided that the practice nurses attended the training. However there is insufficient information about how the fidelity of the intervention as delivered by the practice nurses was monitored. How did the support dietician confirm that this was delivered as per protocol.

6. The qualitative findings were all positive except for a comment about group participation. Was there any variance in responses of patients or nurses? Was there any difference based on their relative success in weight loss.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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