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Reviewer's report:

The authors present their findings on an unsuccessful feasibility study looking at the effects of an exercise intervention in patients with 'pre-diabetes'. Despite the failed attempt to recruit a sufficiently large sample size to complete the study, the analysis of the causes of this are a useful addition to the literature.

Minor comments:

Abstract:

Lines 29-31: this cannot be stated as fact, please include the word 'often' before 'fail to demonstrate'.

Introduction:

Lines 112-113: The citations provided for this statement are very old, is there any newer data available?
Lines 127: Considering the focus of the study, a brief introduction of what REHIT involves would be helpful.
Lines 127-129: Please mention that affective responses to REHIT have been investigated (Songsorn et al (2019) https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2019.1593217).

Discussion:

It would be helpful to provide a comparison with similar unsuccessful feasibility studies. Where the identified reasons for the lack of success similar?

Lines 461-463: Can the authors provide an estimate of the total time commitment required by participants to attend an exercise session (i.e. travel time + time at the clinic)? The exercise sessions may have been short, but the total time commitment is likely substantial. This is worth commenting on.
Lines 514-516: Please acknowledge the influence of timing of the measurement on these results. Presumably taking measures of affect and RPE will be quite different when taken just before or just after a sprint.

Line 579: It is worth noting that commercially available specialised exercise bikes that allow unsupervised REHIT sessions have been used in previous studies (e.g. Cuddy et al., 2019; PMID: 30736402).
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