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**Reviewer's report:**
This is a well reported and well written paper describing an RCT of lifestyle advice through peer advisors to reduce cardiometabolic risk factors. It is an important piece of work.

1. Really 100% inactive? Do other papers saying the same?
2. Should be intention to treat—include participants even if they do not attend (as long as they have post data, but can also undertake data carried forward) and then a per protocol analysis for those attending the intervention
3. Fidelity of the intervention—did the peers deliver what was within the protocol?
4. Although in the protocol paper, it would be helpful to have a summary included in this paper of the selection criteria to be a peer educator, the training involved, criteria for 'failing' the training, how many there were over the 3 years, their drop out and de novo training rate. what ongoing support did they have
5. Health economic analyses would be very useful—are these planned?
6. There are some discussion points in the results eg "However the clinical impact/significance of these differences is likely to be modest." These should be removed

**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.
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 recommend additional statistical review

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