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Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: MS: 1249966125712350, ‘Using formative research to develop the healthy eating component of the CHANGE! school-based curriculum intervention’

My co-authors and I would like to thank the Reviewers and Editor for their constructive comments regarding the above manuscript. Please find below a point-by-point breakdown of changes made and responses to the comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. ‘More clarity is needed on the PRECEDE component. What is the PRECEDE component of this paper?’
   Authors: More information has been included regarding the PRECEDE component of the study within the Abstract and Method sections. Reference is made to a previous study (Mackintosh et al.) recently published in BMC Public Health conducted by the group that has utilised this method.

2. ‘I would suggest the author to put more information of the results….it seems there are not enough components to design a school-based curriculum.’
   Authors: The findings from this study were used in combination with the findings from the first qualitative paper (Mackintosh et al.) to give local context/voice to the intervention design, in combination with empirical evidence to design the intervention. As such the information included within this paper was sufficient to supplement existing knowledge regarding health eating in children whilst allowing the research team to tailor the curriculum to the specific needs of the participants.

3. ‘They stated that….limit knowledge in respect of dairy product’
   Authors: This statement has been removed from the manuscript (page 11).

4. The incorrect spelling of the word ‘focus’ has been corrected (page 12).

5. Reference 1 from the references list has been amended to follow the BMC Public Health style correctly.
Reviewer 2:

1. **Abstract methods:** ‘It will be better to give more detail for the acronym PRECEDE’
   Authors: The acronym PRECEDE has been left in the abstract as this a standard term, and this maintains consistency with other journal articles within BMC Public Health that have used this model.

2. The objective of the study has been clarified throughout.

3. ‘Procedures.....who was/were the interviewers’
   Authors: This has been clarified and reference has been made to the Mackintosh et al. paper that contains the full details of the procedures used including sampling, researchers, PRECEDE-PROCEDE model etc.

4. ‘Procedures paragraph 1. I feel that the description of the procedures will be better if detailed information on PRECEDE component is given’
   Authors: More information on the model has been provided.

5. ‘Will it be better if you could explain why you need to conduct both individual and group interview’
   Authors: This information, and other information relevant to points 3-5 is contained in the BMC Public Health Mackintosh et al. paper, readers are directed to this paper earlier in the procedures section if they require further more detailed information.

6. ‘In general, it is a little difficult to read the result. It will be better to describe the result by divided into section related to the PRECEDE model...’
   Authors: The dynamics of the focus groups and the direction the discussions took meant that the children/adults did not provide enough depth on specific PRECEDE based questions and thus superficial answers resulted related which caused an issue at analysis with regard to clear deduction of categories associated with the PRECEDE component of the model. Rather than force a ‘fit’ through the themes, the key themes or categories presented are those that were born out of the pen profiling analysis and therefore closely reflect the ‘true’ data.

7. ‘Influences to health eating, 4th paragraph, what is the supporting evidence that the school was a key influential factor?’
   Authors: This section has been expanded and supported with a quote.

8. ‘Barriers to Healthy Eating: First paragraph ‘the smell of good food....a chippy’ what does good food here mean?’
   Authors: Describing food as ‘good’ is a very common term to refer to food that individuals feel taste good/are highly palatable.

9. Discussion, 1st line, the aims have been altered throughout.

10. Discussion, 4th line ‘The limited body of knowledge that has utilized this method of data analysis....which method was used?’
    Authors: This has been clarified.
11. ‘There is a full length discussion about overt and covert control….please state more clearly in the methodology’
   Authors: The discussion about control is based on findings from the present study and is born out of the data analysis rather than a theme that was explicitly examined during interview, and therefore as this is a discussion of a finding information does not appear in the methodology.

12. Discussion. The term ‘carer’ has been removed from the 5th paragraph.

13. Discussion: 8th paragraph ‘visual exposure may be a beneficial potential strategy for children with respect to fruit but not vegetables….what is the evidence to exclude vegetables?’
   Authors: This section has been clarified.

14. Discussion: ‘I could [not] find tiredness in Figure 6’
   Authors: The term ‘shattered’ described by one parent in Figure 6 is a widely used term to convey fatigue and tiredness.

15. Conclusion: ‘In general the conclusion is too long and not very concise…’
   Authors: The conclusion has been cut down and condensed.

16. Background: a reference has been added to support the first statement.

17. A reference is included that refers to the increased prevalence of obesity and the plateau in prevalence (Boddy et al. 2010).

18. Figures: Keys have been added to the figures.

Editor’s Comments:
1. Figure legends have been placed before tables.
2. Legends have been removed from figure titles.
3. The ethics committee has been named in the procedures section.
4. RATS guidelines have been reviewed when preparing the manuscript.

I have uploaded a highlighted version of the article where changes have been made using the ‘track changes’ option and a ‘cleaned’ version where changes have been accepted.

My co-authors and I look forward to hearing the outcome of the review.

Yours Faithfully,

Dr. Lynne M. Boddy