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December 30, 2011

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

Dear Dr Thomson,

Thanks for the extremely helpful review regarding organizing and condensing our manuscript. We have made the following changes (in italics) in response to your direction:

-- ..the methods are described over pages 6-12- but the methods heading appears on page 9 in what appears to be in the middle of the methods section.

The Methods section now begins on page 6.

-- In addition 6 pages of methods is very long and would benefit from being cut by one third.

This section has been substantially reduced, with some material moved to the Results section as directed below, and the remainder condensed by about a third.

-- The findings of the investigative work and data collection used to inform the intervention are described on page 11 & 12- some data appearing in the methods section and some in the results section. The data should not appear in the methods section.

There now are no data at all in the Methods section, with the description of information from review of the literature and informal groups now integrated into
the Results (points 1-3, pages 8-9).

-- The resultant intervention is described over 14-18, this could also benefit from being shortened a bit- say from 5 pages to 3.

The material that previously appeared on pages 14-18 has been condensed into pages 11-13, beginning under the heading: “Intervention design”.

-- Under the heading “intervention design” the authors start by describing the population used to pilot the intervention- this merits its own sub-heading and I would suggest follow after the description of the intervention but precede the description of the development and selection of outcome measures.

This section has now been moved to the end of page 13 and given the heading: “Targeted participants”.

-- I am not clear what the purpose of the remainder of the section “intervention design” is- it appears to describe components of the intervention which is described in detail in the section “structure of the intervention”- it would be better if these two sections could be integrated. Or it maybe that the authors wanted to provide an overview of the intervention approach and components before detailing further under “theoretical model” and “structure of the intervention”. If this is the case the sub-heading should indicate that the section provides an overview of the resultant intervention and its approach and the section should be shortened to a few sentences.

Much of this section has now been absorbed into “Structure of the Intervention” (page 12, first paragraph). The rest has been given the subheading “Cultural acceptability concerns” (page. 10).

-- The heading “measurement” is not clear and it would be helpful to clarify what is meant the following paragraph contains, e.g. “development and selection of outcome measures to assess intervention impacts”.

This heading has now been changed to “Development and selection of outcome measures to assess intervention impact” (page 14).

We believe this is a much clearer and better organized paper as a result of these changes. We hope you will agree.

Sincerely,

Sunita Stewart