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Author’s response to reviews:

Associate Editor's comments

The manuscript has undergone several rounds of peer review. In the interests of avoiding further delay I am recommending an 'accept' decision, but there are some changes the authors should be asked to make to the final version of the manuscript. If you agree with my recommendation to accept the manuscript then the following changes would need to be made:

1. The trial registration refers to eligibility based on a Diabetes Risk Score of >5. The manuscript refers to a score >=5. I would suggest the authors rephrased the sentence to: “The seminal DPP trial demonstrated that lifestyle intervention reduced diabetes incidence by 58% (95% CI 48 to 66%) (13); since then, the intervention has been implemented in hospital, community, workplace, and other settings (28). “

2. On p17 line 279 the newly added statement “…demonstrated lifestyle intervention reduced diabetes…” doesn’t read well. I would suggest the authors rephrased the sentence to: “The seminal DPP trial demonstrated that lifestyle intervention reduced diabetes incidence by 58% (95% CI 48 to 66%) (13); since then, the intervention has been implemented in hospital, community, workplace, and other settings (28). “

3. The authors include a lot of pre-post intervention change results (table 3-5 and the text) from a small single group study design. These are described as secondary measures and the authors feel strongly that they wish to retain them. The EiC (Prof Lancaster) provided some guidance on this matter and would like the authors to
include confidence intervals for the pre-post intervention changes reported in each relevant section: in Abstract (p3 lines 52-53), the description of the statistical analysis in Methods (p9 lines 177-182) and Results (tables 3-5 and the text describing these results). The authors should also aim to cut down the duplication of results between tables 3-5 and text. Response: We edited the abstract and Tables 3-5 to include 95% CI per the editor’s suggestion. We modified the methods to include: “We report 95% confidence intervals for differences in means. “We also reduced the replication of results between the tables and text by deleting text on pages 15-16.

4. The authors have also conducted a number of paired samples t-tests and chi-squares on the pre-post changes, reporting the relevant p values in the text. The EiC has stated the authors should include a cautionary sentence in the Methods (statistical analysis section) and the Discussion, noting the limitations of these test results based on an underpowered study. Response: To the methods, we added: “Caution is warranted in interpreting level of statistical significance of these comparisons, given the small sample size of this study.” We added the following phrase to the discussion (Page 19, line 302): “that was underpowered to detect changes in secondary outcomes”