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Reviewer’s report:

This paper describes the process evaluation of the iPlay program, a program aimed at preventing physical activity related injuries in primary school children. The program is evaluated using the REAIM framework. The question posed by the authors is well defined. However, questionnaire are used by authors to evaluate iPlay and there is little description of these questionnaires. The data is sound but poorly described in places; there is a lack of detail. Similarly, the discussion and conclusions section are not focused adequately on the evaluation of the process of the program. The authors acknowledge previous work upon which they are building. The title is accurate but the methods and and conclusion sections of the abstract needs to focus on the process evaluation of the program.

Detailed comments

Discretionary Revisions

Introduction
1st para: change “stimulated” to possibly “Encouraged”

Methods
iPlay-program 3rd paragraph, as before, consider using “encouraged” rather then “stimulated”:

Results
Implementation, 1st paragraph, 2nd and 3rd sentence, consider rewording the 2nd sentence and then swapping order of these sentences.

Major Compulsory Revisions
I feel there is a lack of information in this section i.e. “three quarters of the teachers displayed the posters” but I would be interested in knowing how many posters there were to display during the duration of the study and how many teachers displayed each poster. Was it the same teachers displaying the posters? Similarly “Most of the teachers indicated they performed the exercises most of the time”, what exactly does this mean? What does “most” mean, what percentage? “Two thirds of the teachers indicated they had adapted the exercises sometimes”, this sounds like there was quite a lot of adaptation, how were the exercises adapted? Doesn’t this mean they didn’t implement the program as intended?
Discussion

I think this section is weak, it needs to focus more on the authors conclusions with reference to the process evaluation and the use of REAIM.
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