The paper describes the process evaluation of the I-Play prevention initiative. The authors used a well established evaluation framework (Re-Aim) and the article was very focused and well written. I applaud the authors for writing up this evidence for publication as these findings are essential to setting-based research (in this case the school setting). I agree with the authors that these type of evaluations are essential if we aim to have public health impact. Many effective interventions sit on the shelf because they haven’t been developed or examined with dissemination (adoption and wide scale implementation) in mind. The evidence-base needs to be improved. The revisions are either discretionary or minor.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes, the purpose of the research was well described. It was not stated specifically as a research question or set of questions but it was clear that the purpose was to look at translatability and feasibility and to explore the limitations.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The methods appeared appropriate although some details would be appreciated.
   a. I would prefer a more specific description of the questionnaire components although the operational terms were well defined on p.5. (Minor)
   b) I would also like to see (if possible from the dataset - DISCRETIONARY) a specific description related to how much intervention dose was delivered (what percentage of students received most lessons/classroom exercises in classes, used the website, read the newsletter and had parents that read the newsletter…etc.) and if there was any indication of ‘dose received’ e.g. did the questionnaires address gains in knowledge (were key messages understood?)
   c) I would also like to see a sentence stating the type of consent process. This consent rate is quite high. Please add whether there was passive or active consent (MINOR)

3. Are the data sound?
   p.7 The authors state that comparing participating and non-participating schools on other variables was impossible because information was lacking. There is often neighbourhood SES data (poverty levels, student literacy levels etc.) collected by government agencies in charge of education (in North America) as
well as school size. This would be valuable information for transferability (what were the characteristics of a school that was willing to participate) – if possible please add it. DISCRETIONARY

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes the manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

p.12 “The i-Play program is a successful start... but further improvement [is needed].

Please add a statement related to the limited evidence of efficacy (statistically) and the trend toward positive results’– and relate this to the findings of the process evaluation. MINOR If many children and parents didn’t read the newsletter or visit the website but did participate in classroom activities - perhaps this was not enough dose to change behaviour. The process evaluation helps to provide information about mechanisms (explanations for the outcomes that were achieved) and this should be mentioned in the discussion.

p.10 – “schools are a good setting for injury prevention program because 100% reach can be achieved” (with such low school level adoption I think this statement is too strong). Consider amending – e.g. Schools are an important setting because the reach into the student body is high (if adoption and implementation is high).

p.12 Please add some wording around “including them during the formative assessment phase to identify their specific needs and constraints DISCRETIONARY

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes, I liked the discussion of the limitations

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes

p.11 Please add some comparison between your process evaluation results and other school-based literature (is this level of adoption, implementation, satisfaction typical in the school-based literature?, comparable to other PA studies in schools?). MINOR

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
This article is well written and easy to read.

p.8. Change was to were: The majority of the teachers were positive about the iPlay-newsletters and 15% were very positive (MINOR)
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