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Dear Editors,

Thank you for the opportunity to re-submit this article. As requested, we have highlighted the changes in the document as ‘tracked changes’ and have detailed the response to the review by Lucie Levesque below. We note that Gerjo Kok did not request any further changes and we thank him for his positive review.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

**Aims:**

How were the aims modified from those outlined in the state-funded program?

- We agree that the rationale for the study to pilot ecological measures does not flow from the original aims of the program and we have attempted to clarify how these aims were modified by adding some more specific information:

In practice, aims b) and c) were modified through participatory research processes [25] to address issues of diet and exercise in a manner that was more aligned with the principles, practices and current priorities of the participating Aboriginal organisations. Rather than developing messages based on the guidelines, the community organisations sought to implement and evaluate interventions that responded more directly to community needs. This process is discussed in detail in an earlier publication [22]. Hence this prospective study aimed to pilot the use of two non-invasive, ecological or ‘system-level’ measures to evaluate a series of health promotion activities implemented in a northern Victorian Aboriginal community.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1) Proper use of that vs. which: To the best of our knowledge we have corrected any instances where ‘that’ and ‘which’ have been used incorrectly.

2) Principal has replaced principle (p.9), paragraph 2.

3) Awkward wording:

Background: 3rd par, 1st sentence: the word ‘however’ was missing and has been inserted.

Aims: 2nd par, first sentence: The wording has been simplified and now reads:

The specific questions addressed in the present study were: 1) for members of the sporting club, what changes were made to the club environment with respect to nutrition and dietary quality and how do they relate to national guidelines for minimising the risk of chronic disease?; and 2) To what degree was the overall health promotion program aligned with an ecological model of health promotion, which addresses the physical, social and policy environments as well as individual knowledge and behaviour?

4) Coding chain: The additional ‘IND’ has been deleted in each case (p.13, p.14, table 4).

5) Table 4: The revised coding has resulted in there being a total of 5 strategies. This has been corrected.

Kind regards,

Rachel Reilly