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RE: 1808541085529703 - Developing Community-based Preventive Interventions in Hong Kong: A Description of the First Phase of the Family Project

Dear Dr Thomson,

Thank you for your review. Please see our revision. Point-by-point changes in response are described below. Each of your comments is followed by our response in italics.

Editor: Before acceptance for publication the authors should clarify in the text that the "Institutional Review Board" is a research ethics committee.

Response: We have clarified on page 8 that the IRB is the research ethics committee of the University of Hong Kong.

Editor: Also confusion persists about the difference between study and intervention- see page 5 "Guidelines provided by the granting agency for the studies to be developed" should this read "interventions to be developed"? If so this should be changed.

Response: We have amended the sentence as suggested to read (page 5): “Guidelines provided by the granting agency for the interventions to be developed were that they should...”

Editor: Also on page 6 "using the best possible study design"- what does this relate to? Is this relating to generating evidence using the best possible study or evaluation design to assess the impacts and effectiveness of any intervention developed?

Response: To clarify our meaning, we have changed the above statement to read (page 6): “using the best possible evaluation design to assess the impact of the interventions to be developed.”

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Sunita M. Stewart