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Reviewer's report:

Editorial comment:

Thank you for submitting the protocol for the Invested in Diabetes study. You have provided evidence that the methodology has already been extensively peer reviewed and, therefore, I have not deemed it necessary to send this out for further peer review from the journal.

I have a small number of editorial comments that should be addressed before publication:

- The CONSORT extension for cluster randomised trials suggests that estimates of intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) that are used in sample sizes should be reported. In your sample size calculation section, you mention that a range of ICCs to inform the sample size calculations (but do not provide detail on the size of ICCs used) - could you please add details

- In the section on moderator analysis, it is unclear from the text whether these analyses will be adjusted for clustering. Please clarify

- In the missing data section, you use the abbreviations MCAR/MAR/MNAR (for missing completely at random/at random/not at random etc). For clarity, please spell out these abbreviations in full at first use.

- In the abstract the abbreviation TTIM is used without previous reference (please clarify)
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