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Reviewer's report:

Major:

What can we learn from this project in other countries than UK?. Most references are from UK. Action research of different models have been used for many years in many countries. When telling that grassroots approach is effective the reader is interested in evidence for this. Why did it work in some settings and not in others? Where and when? And is it true that top-down is completely ineffective? This may lead to conclusions regarding what you missed in your own planning process. This should be included in your discussion. As it is now your paper is mainly a description of what you have done without any effort to describe why you were not so successful. What was innovative- testing new hypotheses? Could the citizen use mail etc? If you give information on this important questions maybe we can learn something new. It is hard work behind your project and your methods and results are well described and acceptable.

Minor:

SF 36 is well known but you should inform the reader about how to interpret the score.

You have described why so few participated at the second interview but was the main reason lack of interest based on how you were running the project?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests