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Reviewer's report:

This study is interesting and definitely needed, given the increased risk of type 2 diabetes in older people. I think the paper should be published after some revisions:*For clarity and consistency, please use type 2 diabetes (instead of diabetes) throughout the paper.*Feasibility and pilot are used interchangeably. I think this is a feasibility study but you should choose one and be consistent.*I think in the methods you can add a few sentences on how the original DPP was adapted for this particular population. *As this is a feasibility study, it would be interesting to have a discussion on lessons learned around the lines of what worked (or not) for whom and why. Based on the questions you asked at the focus groups, I expected more detailed analysis of barriers and facilitators to engaging with the program. I appreciate the numbers regarding weight loss, attendance etc. as they are promising but I think it is more important to discuss the actual feasibility of the study. *I also think you should clarify how you analysed the data - did you group answers as per focus group questions?*I am confused about the participation numbers - if 16 people took part and 12 were assessed for objectives, why did 23 people take part in the focus groups?
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