Major Revisions
1) Differences and similarities between the socioeconomic group: In the study, the authors analyse perceptions on healthy lifestyles and lifestyle advice in low and high socioeconomic status (SES) groups to identify specific perceptions among individuals in the low SES group. From the results presented in the paper, it seems to me that there were many similarities and only a few differences in the perceptions among the individuals in the high and the low SES group. If this is the case there should be a clear statement on this issue. Stressing differences in the health perceptions and habits between SES groups can easily lead to stigmatisation. So, be careful with language (e.g., Background section, first paragraph „In general, persons with low SES eat less healthy“, rather say "...are less likely to eat healthy") and consider that the low SES group (and the high SES group of course, too) is a diverse population that cannot be reduced to single lifestyle attributes. The finding that the participants from all groups preferred lifestyle advice tailored to their personal situation may be taken as hint that taking broad SES categories into account is not enough.

2) Gender aspects: The focus groups were separated by gender and SES (which is good) but there are no gender specific results reported. We know that participation rates in behaviour-oriented interventions tends to be lower in men than in women. What are the differences and similarities in the perceptions between women and men (within and between SES strata)?

3) Sample selection: nine focus group discussions were conducted. Reasons should be given for this number. Was it merely a convenience sample composition? Or: Did the authors expect to reach some sort of theoretical saturation by this sample size? Of course, qualitative research does not aim to achieve ‘representativeness’, but still the authors should state whether they had the impression that all relevant aspects were covered by this sample.

There are notable differences between the high and low SES groups with regard to age and BMI. The author should critically discuss how this may have compounded the results.

Minor issues
1) Several time term ‘social factors’ is used (e.g., support for lifestyle change section first paragraph; Making lifestyle changes section first paragraph). I don’t
really understand what is meant by this term.

2) Background section: 'layperson' as a term for people (who are indeed experts of their own perceptions and life circumstances) is a bit odd, should be deleted.
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