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Reviewer's report:

This paper investigated awareness, adoption and implementation of the ANGCY among recreational facilities in Alberta, Canada, one year following their release. The authors gathered important data in a sample of managers of publicly funded recreational facilities that served food.

I have some problems with the way the data are presented and some suggestions for further improvement.

In page 9, authors stated that “One half of managers in the study sample had heard of the ANGCY (Figure 2). None of the quantitative independent variables predicted…”; given the statistical procedures and the cross sectional design I suggest using “were associated…” instead of “predicted”.

It would be important to have descriptive data (and the respective statistics for the associations) for the factors that contributed to knowledge of the ANGCY, and other variables in the results section that missed this quantitative information (eg, in page 10, “indicating the presence of a “champion”) (p = 0.04). Conversely, facilities were less likely to implement the ANGCY if the priority for healthy eating was medium to high (p = 0.04)…”; in page 11, “some resented…”, “For others…”; in page 12, “several managers…”, etc.).

In the ANGCY adoption and implementation results section, I suggest to move the sentence “…stages 3-5 of the Stages of Change construct [28] (preparation, action and maintenance)…” to the methods section, and explain how Stages of Change theory was integrated when analysing results.

In page 11., “survey was not designed to assess the extent of change made” should be analyzed in the discussion section.

So I think this paper would benefit from revised analyses and the other sections of the paper should then be revised accordingly.
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