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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The present “Background” in abstract is actually objective of this study, no background was presented here, please add background of this study.

2. “Methods” in abstract should focus on the design and data collection and analysis method of this study instead of introducing the PRORIVA

3. It is difficult to get the Conclusion based on the Results presented in the abstract. This is to say Results and Conclusion in abstract can be perfected.

4. It is necessary to make more clear statement of the aim of this study at the end of the introduction. Otherwise readers would think this study is reporting some kind of process evaluation, impact evaluation of the PRORIVA program. The first paragraph in Discussion section can be used to describe the aim of this study.


- Minor Essential Revisions

1. As the title of this study, you can keep you original one “A community intervention for behaviour modification: an experience to control cardiovascular diseases in Yogyakarta, Indonesia” since you did evaluate impact of the intervention. This intervention should be community-based intervention?

2. Abbreviation presented for the first time in abstract should be present together with the full name of it. For example, SES in the first sentence of method.

3. Figure1 and 2: these 2 figures can be modified and present more clearly.
Author can refer to the study by Pronyk PM et al. to describe the design of this study. (Pronyk PM, Hargreaves JR, Kim JC, Morison LA, Phetla G, Watts C, Busza J, Porter JD. Effect of a structural intervention for the prevention of intimate-partner violence and HIV in rural South Africa: a cluster randomised trial. Lancet. 2006 Dec 2;368(9551):1973-83.)

4. Last sentence of paragraph 4 in Discussion (How the participants response to PRORIVA....) should be put the next paragraph which is lessons learned from this study.

5. It is best to add a subtitle “Limitations” before state the limitations of this study.

6. Results of Chi-square test were presented in table 3, but where are the results from logistic regression analysis? How to say “but knowledge among men neared a significant difference in the referent area (69%) versus the intervention area (59%)”? Did you say “neared a significant difference” according to the P value?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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