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Author's response to reviews: see over
Response to Reviewers’ Comments
Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We appreciate the reviewers’ valuable comments and we feel the changes have strengthened our paper considerably. We have addressed all the reviewers’ comments and made changes to the manuscript accordingly.

Reviewer 1:

Methods:
-pg 6, line 123: please briefly identify or provide an example of what “logistics” refers.
Change has been made (line 121-122); logistics referred to interview procedures being explained and site visit dates arranged with the organizers.

-pg 6, line 129: this paper focuses on an adolescent population however the high end of the age range is 25, which would reflect young adulthood. Can the authors please provide some justification as to why they included this/these individuals in the sample as I would speculate that experiences, reasons for participation, barriers/challenges etc., for these individuals would be very different in this age groups versus those that are 12-17 years of age.
This is a good observation. We have inserted an endnote into the manuscript (p.33) to clarify this point for the reader: Three participants ages 21, 22, and 25 took part of a swimming program for individuals with disabilities. The program focused on adolescents and their families, but organizers did not prevent older individuals from participating. We chose to include their experiences to represent the diversity of cases supported by the microgrant funding.

-please indicate what age of majority refers to.
Change has been made – age of majority refers to 18 years of age. (line 138)

-page 8, lines 164-168: please provide some examples of the actual schedule of questions for each sample group (adolescents and organisers) or provide an appendix listing both interview schedules.
Examples of actual interview questions have been provided in the text (p.8).

-pg 9, line 190-191: please indicate the main themes are further broken down into subthemes. Although this is outlined in the table, it would helpful to have these listed in the text.
Change has been made – subthemes are listed with the main themes (lines 194-198)

Results:
-I do have some concerns regarding how the results have been reported. In the current format it is very hard to distinguish between the results of the participants themselves (adolescents) and the organisers. On page 8 the authors outline main topic areas for each sample group, which vary in some instances, thus it is difficult to understand how this data has been organised under the same themes for both groups. I suggest that the authors
elaborate on how the results were organised under these themes or consider an alternative reporting format, such as splitting the results for each subsample or another way that is reader friendly.

We chose to analyze the data for each case site as a group, and we did not separate organizers vs. participants’ responses, which is why there is sometimes data from both groups within a theme (case-by-case analysis is described on p.9). We have clarified this in the analysis section (lines 182-193): Community organizers’ and adolescents’ interviews from each site were coded together collectively as a case before moving onto the next case. We have also tried to clarify this issue for the reader in the manuscript by describing how the adolescents’ data were incorporated into the results (lines 199-202): Since the focus of the study was on the implementation of the microgrant funding, the majority of the data presented below was reported by organizers, although some themes such as Impact of Program: Teen Participants and Community are supplemented with data from adolescents participating in the programs.

-again, on pg 8,line 167 the main topics of event/program implementation and facilitators and barriers to running the events/programs is listed for the organiser interviews, however these findings are not clear in the results. What theme or subthemes do these outcomes fall under? Further clarification is needed.

We have restructured the results and the table to better clarify this theme within the results (addition of theme ‘Running Programs and Events: Facilitators and Barriers/challenges - see p.12-15 and Table 2)

-when identifying the individual comments, it would be also helpful to include which is an organiser or adolescent response after the comment. For example, page 9, line 204: consider changing (MB P8) to (MB organiser P8) or a similar format.

-change has been made.

-pg 18-19, lines 410-415: this is a lengthy response and should be indented.

-change has been made.

-pg 21, lines 466-470: this is a lengthy response and should be indented.

-change has been made.

Discussion:
-the discussion is well written and supports the majority of the results, however some adjustments are required. For instance, there is warranted discussion concerning the benefits and challenges associated with infrastructure, provision of equipment, adolescent participation, etc., however this is not clear in the results section and thus makes this part of the discussion seem irrelevant. However, this may be further clarified by addressing this in the results section as indicated above.

-change has been made to the results section, which clarifies the point here about the discussion.

-pg 25, lines 556-560: I would consider these recommendations as results and would suggest some re-arranging. Providing ideas as to how you might implicate these recommendations in the future would be an interesting addition to the discussion.
We have added more detail here with suggestions about implementing recommendations for organizations (p.28)

**Reviewer 2:**

**Background**
1. Page 2, line 27: Suggest creating an acronym for Physical Activity (PA). The use of this acronym is commonplace throughout PA research.
   Change has been made. (exceptions are when referring to the Teen Physical Activity Grants)

**Methods**
1. Page 2, line 30: Suggest removing reference [1] from abstract and provide only within the manuscript itself.
   Change has been made.

2. Page 2, line 30: Please write out numbers less than ten.
   Change has been made.

**Background**
1. Page 3, line 54: Suggest describing briefly the other factors.
   Change has been made: other factors include body mass index, gender, ethnicity, self-efficacy, and social/parental barriers.

2. Page 3, lines 58-59: Suggest removing ‘(see www.globalpa.org.uk)’ and all other web links from the text and placing them within the reference section unless required by journal.
   Change has been made – we have removed the globalpa.org.uk website from the text, however we left the www.participaction.com/teen-challenge website on p.5 since there is no reference to it in the reference list.

3. Page 3, lines 69-70: In some places ‘community organizations’ is capitalized. Please choose one style.
   Change has been made – we have remove capitalizations throughout the manuscript.

4. Page 4, line 75: Please define the ‘WALK’ and ‘AU’ acronyms in first use. For example ‘Women’s Active Living Kits (WALK) Community Grant Scheme’
   Method Change has been made.

1. Page 5, line 114: Suggest not capitalizing ‘Organization’.
   Change has been made.

2. Page 7, line 141: Should ‘assent’ be consent here?
   Consent is given by individuals who have reached the legal age of consent (typically 18 years old). Assent is the agreement of someone not able to give legal consent to participate in the activity.
Results
1. Page 13, line 289: Please write out the number ‘9’.
Change has been made.

Discussion
1. Page 22, lines 485-487: Suggest rewriting the opening sentence more concisely and omitting the parentheses. ‘The objective of this multiple case study was to explore the potential role of microgrants (in this case, Teen Physical Activity Grants) in enhancing physical activity opportunities for Canadian adolescents.’
Change has been made – sentence has been rewritten as: “The objective of this study was to explore the role of microgrants for enhancing physical activity opportunities for Canadian adolescents.” (p.24)

2. Page 22 line 494: Again, the use of parentheses is unnecessary and employed excessively throughout the entire manuscript.
We have reduced the use of parentheses throughout the manuscript where appropriate.

3. Suggest removing ‘and colleagues’ throughout the entire manuscript and replacing with ‘et al.’ when appropriate.
Change has been made.

4. Page 24, lines 529-531: The authors state that ‘Building on this qualitative study, objective measurement of physical activity is likely needed to accurately assess such impact, although and appropriate research design to test such effects is likely prohibitive.’ but never state why it is prohibitive. Is this due to cost of the necessary devices, lack of widely accepted methods for assessing PA objectively, or possibly low levels of compliance?
We have expanded on this point to indicate that using such a research design is challenging for two main reasons: first, to objectively assess the impact of microgrant-funded programs on adolescents’ physical activity, it would be necessary to track adolescents’ activity before and after the implementation of a physical activity program supported by a microgrant, which would be logistically challenging considering it is not known which adolescents might participate in any given program; second, the cost associated with such an approach would likely be substantial. (p.26)