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Reviewer’s report:

Overall there is a good paper here, but as currently written it is overly confusing. This can likely be rectified with some editing and re-grouping of some of the sections. It may be easier to present more of the information on each of the two provinces together and then do the compare/contrast. As written it flips back and forth and as the language and terms is very similar it becomes very hard to follow and understand. Please also pay attention to verb tense - it flips back and forth, but much of what is currently in present tense may be easier to understand in past tense as this is now somewhat of a retrospective survey of these documents.

At times there seems to be value judgments on the approaches taken to prepare the two frameworks when these, as noted in passing, may have more to do with the historical system legacies in each province. Be careful to not conflate systems with choices - alternatively, more evidence must be presented that these were choices and not your analysis or conjecture about why the development happened as it did.

It would be better to avoid the term "evaluation" in the abstract and introduction as you go on later to specifically say this is not an evaluation because it is too early in the implementation. Rather, this is an analysis that could aid future evaluations.

The description of the BC system on page 6 could be much clearer.

Providing a high-level summary of the chronic disease prevention/management landscape in each province as part of the background may help with the contextualization later (ie what these frameworks are and are not supporting or complementing).

On page 8 - should read 'the then Ministry of Health Promotion'

On page 10 - what are "minor" government documents?

For the results section starting page 12 - generally there could be some more explanation of the results. Few too many throwaway sentences or "so what" statements.

Components . . page 14 - how many did you expect? is it interesting there were as many that were similar as much as one that was different? Does it matter that
one was different?

On page 15 - how does the paragraph on partnerships relate to the section? is it an additional finding?

Use of information page 17 - this section could be a lot clearer - what does information mean? defined? how do you know that one was conceptualized that clearly? Is this really a contrast between the two provinces or just a difference?

page 20 - discussion - why did you expect this kind of compare and contrast to be easy?

page 21 - program delivery - watch statements on what are system differences rather than inherent value differences. Is the part about delivery relevant if you are talking about theories and frameworks?

page 22 equity - why do you say this about the BC approach? how do you know it might reflect more of a commitment to social inclusion v. Ontario? The results section did not really lead there

page 25 - could discuss in greater detail the impact of starting from nothing v. building from previous work, these seems possibly more significant and important than the discussion implies.

page 27 - "from the start . . ." this sentence has quite a judgmental tone, can you provide a rationale for one being better than the other? Or is this because of the circumstances that each province was starting with?
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