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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for sending me this article to review. The article describes the mixed methods pilot study of an intervention in general practice concerning the pre-diabetes led by nurses.

The topic is relevant and focuses on real life settings. It was relevant to emphasize this point. The introduction is well written. The authors should describe in more details the way other studies did not set in real life.

The articulation between the six components of the multilevel package should be resumed in a scheme. The authors should distinguish the differences between the study and the feasibility evaluation. The feasibility study in itself was qualitative and not quantitative, wasn't it? I was puzzled by the mixed method study in the title.

The usual care should be more detailed. What implies a green prescription?

The discussion section should begin with a summary of the main results. As the control group did not have the same number of visits, how to be sure that the differences between the two groups are due to the intervention and not to frequent patient centered care visits in the intervention group? Why not including the same number of visits with different nurses on another topic for the patients of the control arm? If significant differences between the two groups are found at the end of the major study, I would ask the same questions: was it because the intervention led by the nurses achieved its goal or because the intervention group patients were involved in a centred and dynamic care through multiple visits whereas the patients in the control group did not have this kind of care? This aspect of the person-centred approach is not enough developed in the discussion.

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

Yes

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

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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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