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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Background: the statement 'DESMOND......effective programme for....' Authors need to state which outcome(s) DESMOND has been shown to be effective for. It is not sufficient to state for 'those with T2D).
2. Background: in a pilot study assessing the consenting rate would also be considered an aim and especially
3. Methods: what are the ethics issues for obtaining capacity to consent-there should be a section in this group that are likely to have literacy and comprehension issues-how will their ability to consent be assessed? Will there be a standardised assessment or the use of the
4. Recruitment strategy: more information on the strategy in terms of the geographical and social and clinical setting-will the investigators use the mental health trusts, social services, what will be the distribution of advertising. A working definition of the target population would help in generalisation. It seems important to have a more detailed pre defined strategy for recruitment to use as a diving board in order to assess reach and the size of the study population they will need to achieve the final sample size.
5. Case definition of intellectual disability (ID) is needed.
6. Unit of randomisation and sample size: this is not clear. The unit should be the participant. But the investigators have also included the carer. The sample size should be only for the participants with ID which if I have understood correctly is n=36 because it stated earlier that n=12 participants will be recruited in each of the nations.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The CONSORT flow chart needs some reorganising. Each box should include an n=...; exclusion box is a sideways box from the arrow between eligibility and baseline data; box for withdrawals; focus groups does not belong in the CONSORT chart in my opinion; not essential but for ease of reading the arrows should follow the same lines vertically ie on the same track

Discretionary Revisions
1. Could rephrase some of the introduction to include 'health inequalities'
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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