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Reviewer's report:

• Major Compulsory Revisions

Introduction
1. In the third paragraph, 4-5 sentences are the reasons for rarely investigating the community based interventions in low and middle countries? And a process evaluation can deal with the problem mentioned in the 4-5 sentences?

2. Paragraph 4-6 should be reorganized. To present the importance of community based interventions for CVDs, then the PRORIVA program, then the necessary of investigation of community based primary-prevention of CVDs, and finally put out the aim of this study.

Methods:
The authors should focus more on study design to answer the questions as follows: how to selected study places? How to determine intervention group and control group? What are the criteria of participants inclusion? How to collect data including baseline data and data related to evaluate the interventions? How to analyze data? How to control the quality of data collection?

1. This study is quasi-experiment study. Author need to describe the study places more clearly. For example, why did you select these communities as referent? How were the 4 communities selected as places to conduct interventions? How to determine the intervention group and control group? Blind criteria were used for the quasi-experimental study?

2. How did the author recruit participants for qualitative study?

3. Data analysis was not described clearly. The first sentence, Chi-square test were used to test difference of proportions of health behaviors at the pre-test and post-test? Why did the author control pretest behaviors when calculated OR by logistic regression? Whether the author give consideration on analyzing the factors associated with the interventions implementation?

Results:
1. It is best to have a flow graph to present the process of participant’s recruitment and exclusion.

2. The process of Data collection and intervention implementation should be: baseline data (pre-test) collection, intervention implementation, and post data collection. Author should present more clearly in the methods part. In the second
paragraph of results, author stated that pretest and interventions had some overlap. Was this in the same community? If yes, how can you get the real data of pretest?

3. In this quasi-experiment study, for quantitative data, the main aim should be to determine the effect of interventions. Therefore, comparing the differences of KAP of participants pretest and post-test should be important. It is best to present the results related to this part and should conduct statistic test on the differences. Of course, the participation rate of different activities among people of different characteristics should be explored. So, it is best for the author to reorganize the data presentation.

4. It is best to report qualitative data in combination with the results of quantitative apart if there are repeated contents which maybe support the results of quantitative results or contrary to quantitative result.

5. Table 3 should present not only the participation of activities at different level of SES, but also in different demographic characters of participants (for example, age, gender, education, occupation and so on), and statistic test should be conduct to test the differences, results of which can be used for guiding further the implementation interventions in specific socioeconomic context.

6. Table 4, the differences of KAP change should be presented not only between gender, also demographic characters of participants and different level of SES, results of that differences should be used for guiding the improvement of the current intervention in different socioeconomic context.

7. Even author mentioned Chi-square tests and logistic regression analysis, but there is no results presented in results section about these analyses.

Discussions
1. Table 5 should not be presented in discussion which can be described in results.

2. Limitation of this study should be discussed. For example, study design (blind criteria, randomized divide study group into intervention and control group), limitations of qualitative study

• Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract:
1. Authors reported the study design as quasi-experiment study. In methods section. They need to describe the process for selection of intervention and control groups. It is unclear which community si the reference setting? “Health behaviors “should be change into “KAP (knowledge, attitude and practice)”

2. It is best to present the statistics data in the results section such as frequency and participation rate of activities. Knowledge increases from what to what?

Introduction
1. It would be good to have a one sentence introduction the global burden of CVDs.

2. Second paragraph, the second sentence needs to be rephrased as it is not
very clearly express the priority of interventions for CVDs in developed countries

# Discretionary Revisions
1. Title can add the information about “results of quasi-experiment study.”
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