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Author’s response to reviews:

March 26, 2020

Re: BGTC-D-19-0064R91 (Response to Peer Review Comments)
Dear Mr. Fabio Salvi,

We would like to thank you for forwarding the peer review comments to us. We have revised the manuscript in response to the reviewer feedback.

Please find our point-by-point response below, which summarizes how we have addressed each of the reviewer’s comments.

We have done our best to address all review comments and look forward to hearing from you soon regarding the revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Jenny Ploeg, RN, PhD

Point-by-Point Response to Reviewer Comments (BGTC-D-19-0064R91)

Reviewer 1

1. Length Reduction: We have revised the introduction and removed some redundancies (pg. 12, 22) to reduce the length, as suggested by Reviewer 1.

Reviewer 2

1. HbA1C: Issue: The reviewer indicated that the importance of HbA1C should be acknowledged in the Discussion & Limitations sections of the paper. Response: We have added a paragraph at the end of the Discussion section to refer to the benefits of capturing HbA1C, and the challenges in interpreting this measure [pg. 21]. We had already mentioned the absence of clinical outcomes in the study limitations, but have clarified in parenthesis after this comment in the limitations that this specific clinical measure (HbA1C) was absent [pg. 22].

2. Exercise: Issue: The reviewer suggested that exercise could be added to additional components of future interventions. Response: Our intervention included physical exercise already, however we acknowledge that varying the type and/or intensity of physical exercise could be explored in future research. We have added a short paragraph on future research directions at the end of the Strengths and Limitations (also retitled to include Future Research). Future research directions include exploring varying types/intensities of physical exercise as well as other intervention components, and we refer to HbA1C as a desirable outcome in future studies. [pg. 23]

3. Randomization Process: Issue: The reviewer requested that more detail on the randomization process be included in the paper (e.g., stratification, block sizes, allocation concealment). Response: We removed the word “stratified” from permuted block design,
because this was referring to randomization within the site and that was already clarified later in the sentence. Site was the only stratification variable, and there were no known site differences (which was added to the paper in the previous revision). We have also included information on the block sizes. We have added ‘independent of the research team’ to the sentence about RedCap, which addresses the reviewer’s concern about allocation concealment (the research team logs into RedCap and obtains the allocation from the software, this allocation cannot be changed by the research team). [Pg. 9]

4. Abstract: Issue: The reviewer suggested removing the secondary analysis results pertaining to mental functioning from the Results and Conclusion and including a comment regarding future research directions to capture HbA1c and exercise. Response: The abstract has been revised in accordance with the reviewer’s recommendations. [Pg. 4]