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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Prof Lancaster and Prof Thabane,

We would like to thank you and your reviewers once again for your constructive comments on our manuscript.

We have addressed all comments (see our response to each comment in red) and are pleased to enclose a revised manuscript with amendments in red and underlined.

If you have any questions or require any additional information please do not hesitate in letting me know.

Sophie Cassidy
Reviewer #1: Thank you for asking me to review the revised version of this manuscript. It is clear that the authors have taken into consideration each of the reviewers comments, which the authors should be commended for. With regard to how the authors have responded to my individual comments; I am satisfied with the revisions made and/or the reply given. The manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Reviewer #2: Thank you for your comprehensive response to my previous comments. I have a few additional comments below.

General comment

Please check for typos: e.g. incluing, technqiues, incorporated

Thank you, we have checked our manuscript and corrected any typos identified.

I've also noticed a few grammatical issues (e.g. "in accordance to")

We have addressed all grammatical issues identified.

Title: I don't think Changing Health fits the way that it is currently incorporated into the study title: suggest omitting

We have amended the study title so that Changing Health is still incorporated within it but fits better.

Abstract: secondary outcomes are referred to but a primary outcome has not been explicitly defined

We have added clarity to the primary aim and outcomes (P2, L8+21).

Introduction

P5 Line 22 - sentence starting ". Specifically, the scope of the intervention was expanded …." is very long
Thank you, we have addressed this issue and split this sentence in to two.

In terms of the Movement as Medicine intervention programme, it would be nice to include mention of some of the component BCTs. For example, you could include them in brackets within the sentence:

"DVD providing narratives of the types of activity others had chosen to successfully manage their diabetes, paper-based resources to help facilitate a discussion about increasing activity levels, and planning and monitoring resources including a pedometer"

Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have included some of the BCTs utilised within the intervention (P5, L9-12).

The word outcomes is used at the end of introduction; but I'm wondering if objectives would be the more appropriate term

We have reworded outcomes to objectives (P6, L7).

Methods

"Recruitment and inclusion criteria"; suggest re-labelling as "Sampling and recruitment"

We have re-labelled this subheading as suggested.

Table 1 presents inclusion/exclusion criteria; but then additional exclusion criteria appear to be introduced later. In Table 1, I don't see mention of the discrepancies/inconsistencies with blood tests that are outlined later on: suggest presenting a more comprehensive summary of inclusion/exclusion criteria

Thank you, we have amended this section of the manuscript to address the comment. We have provided the subheading ‘Inclusion/exclusion criteria’ and have rearranged the layout so that the text regarding blood result discrepancies relates to the criteria outlined in Table 1 (P7-8).

Intervention

The new text that is introduced does not sit correctly - suggest revising this section to aid flow

"A mixed methods approach will be adopted to establish feasibility and acceptability. As such we will collect data on the following:" This format doesn't work; suggest replacing with
"A mixed methods approach will be adopted to establish feasibility and acceptability. As such we will collect data on feasibility and acceptability as outlined below."

We have amended the manuscript as suggested (P10, L6).

It would be good to define the feasibility parameters e.g. what do you mean by adherence rates? How will these be calculated? etc

Thank you for highlighting these omissions in our manuscript. We have now provided additional detail to address the comment raised (P6).

In terms of order, I am not sure why qualitative investigation and progression criteria are introduced between primary and secondary outcomes - this doesn't flow correctly

We have amended the methods section of the manuscript to address this comment (P12,13).

Criteria to proceed to a larger evaluation: some of these are potentially overly rigid or open to considerable interpretation - is it realistic to expect to retain all 40 participants (if that is your "required number"), what is satisfactory engagement?

The following paper might be worth consulting:


Thank you for drawing our attention to this helpful publication. We have referred to this paper and amended our progression criteria accordingly (P13,L3-13).