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Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript entitled “A conative educational model for an intervention program in obese youth” for re-submission to *BMC Public Health*.

As requested by the reviewers, we have made the appropriate changes in the paper; they are highlighted in red. Our responses to the reviewers’ comments are listed below.

We thank the reviewers for their constructive remarks to improve the quality of this manuscript. We hope it will now be suitable for publication in *BMC Public Health*.

Regards,

J Vanhelst
Reviewer 1

1. Overall, this is a very interesting paper. The submission is well written and well organized. The question posed by the authors is well defined. The method and results are clearly presented and lead the author to a reasonable and interesting discussion of the findings. The conative theoretical framework should be better explained. I only propose minor revisions for the proposal:

2. Pages 4 and 6: Your explanation of the "Conative Educational Model" is too vague. At that point, the word “conative” should be defined in order to help the reader. The core concepts which organize the curriculum could also be briefly introduced as well (structure, function, and technique). This second part could also be done later on. Defining the concept conation is of main importance as you will refer to cognitive approaches many times afterwards. The reader will then be able to make the difference between your approach and others and, as a result, will truly understand the importance of this paper.

As suggested, the conative educational model has been more developed in the introduction section and method section.

3. page 7: Sphinx, not “Sphynx”

As suggested the word sphynx has been replaced by sphinx.

4. page 8: p should be written with an italic format.

Done.

Reviewer 2

This submission seems acceptable as currently written. However, it could be improved with very minor revision. The paper presents the results achieved through the implementation of a health-wellness intervention program in obese youth (program CEMHaVi). The submission is well constructed and well referenced. The experimental approach is clearly exposed. It seems original because the intervention program uses a unique concept: the "Conative Educational Model". For a better understanding, it would be better if the “conative approach” was better specified and explained. The results are presented clearly. They are significant that it makes the study very interesting. The paper appears to me very interesting and should be published. It would nevertheless be desirable to specify the model ("Conative Educational Model") to develop more the “conative approach” : we just know that it's an individualized intervention program, based on a pedagogical differentiation (page 4).

As suggested, the conative educational model has been more developed in the introduction section and method section.

Editorial Comments

1. The Background Section of your Abstract needs some context info.

As requested, some context info has been added in the background section of the abstract. The sentences “Obesity in children has increased in recent years throughout the world and is associated with adverse health consequences. Early interventions, including appropriate
pedagogy strategies, are important for a successful intervention program” have been added in the abstract section.