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**Reviewer's report:**

The following comments should be addressed:

**Major Compulsory Revisions:**

- 

**Minor Essential Revisions:**

The study outcomes could be defined more clearly in the background section in the abstract and on page 8, line 14.

Page 6, line 20: I would prefer having the page reference in the reference section.

Page 7, line 3: “an individuals” should be changed to “an individual’s”.

Page 8, line 3: Again, I would prefer having the page reference in the reference section. It is not clear which reference (18, 19, 20 or 21) the page reference is referring to.

Page 10, line 21: Please describe the training process in more detail: How much training did the SPCs get and who trained them?

Data about the parents/guardians socio-economic status have been collected in the study. What is the rationale for not adjusting for SES in the analyses? It would be useful if the authors discussed how low SES might bias some of the findings.

Even though the authors mention that the measurement of physical activity assessment (20-metre shuttle run) is a limitation, the authors could discuss further how that might have biased some of the findings. Further, pubertal status is not assessed in the children and how could that have affected the physical fitness results?

It would be useful if the authors discussed their thoughts about sustainability of the student public commitment in the HEALTHY intervention.

**Discretionary Revisions:**

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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