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Reviewer's report:

Garnæs et al. presented an interesting secondary analysis of ETIP randomised trial. The overall quality of work is good and the manuscript reads well. I have only minor remarks to the author.

Discussion

In the first paragraph of the discussion the author claims that the reduction in the insulin sensitivity might indicate a reduced risk for developing T2DM. Is this not a bit too far fetched conclusion taking into account that the analysis for T2DM was not statistically significant, and the confidence intervals around the effect on the insulin levels rather wide?

Generalisability

In the earlier part of the manuscript the authors specified that only half of women in the exercise arm adhered to the exercise protocol. Can the author explain why in this case, she thinks that the recruited women can over-represent highly motivated women?

In the text I would recommend instead of using 'high BMI' 'BMI >25 kg/m2' for more clarity.

The last sentence in the first part of discussion seems detached from the rest of the text. Was it meant to be part of the previous paragraph or a standalone sentence?

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.

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

Unable to assess

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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