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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript has been improved by the amendments made, but I suggest the following revisions before it can be accepted:

Major compulsory revisions:

1. There is some unnecessary repetition in the Introduction and in the chapter titled as "Relevance of findings". From the point of view of the relevance of this study reference to the need and effectiveness of primary prevention is not very relevant. The authors should focus on the issues were the results of this study are in line with previous studies, and what was not known before.

2. The setting and the study population are better defined than in the previous version, but it is still unclear whether all persons in the GP lists or those identified as eligible via the CRD were included. Was there really a sample or was the whole target population (those in the selected age group and living in the study area) invited?

3. The data analysis is still described at a too general level. A general definition of thematic analysis is not needed but rather a detailed description of how it was applied in this study.

4. The strengths and limitations are not in line with the criteria for qualitative studies. E.g. the small sample size is not a problem if there were several participants confirming the same themes or if the themes were repeated in both focus groups (saturation).

Minor essential revisions:

5. The figure is not very informative if this refers to the total target population of the intervention: How does this apply for the Ferguslie Park or for the study participants? I would like to see some comparison between the target population and the participants. The number of men and women are given for the focus group participants, but were there more women than men in the participants for the screening? Is there any information on the differences in socioeconomic background or gender distribution of the target group, screening participants and focus group participants?

6. The last sentence under “Conclusions” is not well grounded by the results of this study. One may draw conclusions on the effectiveness of recruitment but not on the effectiveness of the actual implementation of the primary prevention
activities.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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