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Reviewer’s report:

I applaud the authors for their perseverance in revising the article. There remain some areas which still require attention, the most glaring which is point #4:

1. I don't think the opening sentence is actually correct. Health care and disease may be on every country's agenda, but this doesn't necessarily translate into investments in and attention toward health promotion activities and interventions. I would advise re-writing this opening line. Please refrain from making global statements such as this without citations!

2. The last line in paragraph 2 doesn't seem very convincing - only 65 local newspapers in the US that cover health? That's a very small number given the size of media in the US. Again, please tone down the intent of the sentence here or delete it altogether.

3. On page 6, the authors write that the quantitative phase of the study was conducted to identify the process of production, selection and dissemination of findings. However, that identical title is also used for the qualitative data.

4. I am still a little confused by the presentation of the qualitative findings: there are no real themes presented, only categories of how the data were organized and coded rudimentarily. I would suggest that either the authors not use the term 'theme' or (preferably) revisit the data to interpret more meaningful themes and patterns. For example, there are multiple references to production processes - how can these be synthesized or conceptualized to offer more meaning?

5. The first line in the conclusion section also need to be clarified: is it more or less incorrect information? Based on the study's findings, it seems clear that information is not very accurate, or at the very least, there is not transparency in the reporting of health news should someone want to verify or follow up with a report on a study.

6. Writing has improved a bit, but there are some very, very long sentences and awkward syntax. I would strongly recommend that a person whose first language is English assist the authors.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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