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Reviewer's report:

Major
I still find this paper difficult to follow. The Results Section does not clearly differentiate between practices that were "non-participants" and those who "withdrew". For example, if "withdrew" before any intervention, data collection took place, were they, in fact, "non-participants". What is the definition of early versus late intervention and what is its relevance?

The first part of the Discussion does not relate to the aims and results of the study. It appears that practical considerations in implementation of the programme accounted for many of the retention problems and would cause me concern if I was supervising the research. Therefore, I feel the Discussion needs further work in order for me to advise publication at present.

Minor
There are still some grammatical and spelling mistakes which are irritating in light of previous reviews, e.g. page 5 - 5 lines from bottom, page 6 - second sentence is too long and convoluted, 3rd sentence "However, each division etc, page 7 - last paragraph - punctuation incorrect, page 10 - 4 lines from bottom - "both" is incorrect.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.