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Reviewer's report:

All along from the beginning of the manuscript, the authors have maintained the use of "diabetes risk". However, suddenly, this was changed on line 95 to read Type 2 diabetes risk. Why this? I was going to ask if the risk in question is about type 1 or type 2. Now that this has come up, it will be appropriate for the authors to stick to one as the different types of diabetes have different risk factors.

Line 101, under objectives, the authors state that the objective is to investigate whether the application of risk prediction model as component of routine screening will help improve physical activity participation. This has to be reviewed. Assessing an individual on risk of a condition does not change the status quo of the individual except if a further step is deliberately taken to educate the patient on his or her risk level. This is what the authors need to add to the sentence.

Line 207 should read the study personnel not personal.

Line 216 -217, the name is International Physical Activity Questionnaire NOT Physical Activity Questionnaire.

Line 213, while the IPAQ is a reliable instrument, it would have been preferable for the researchers to adopt a more objective measure in this study, such as accelerometry or at least a pedometer.

231, under secondary outcomes, is the interest on counselling process for nutrition or the actual nutrition adopted by the participants? I suppose the authors should be more interested in the actual diet consumed by the participants and not only on the counselling that they received.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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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?
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Quality of written English
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