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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Line 61 says that ten CPS schools were recruited, but Line 175 mentions seven partner schools. Please clarify the role(s) of the other three schools.

2. Methods Section. The flow of the recruitment process is unclear:
   a. How were schools recruited/approached?
   b. Can you estimate a response rate?
   c. The basis for school recruitment is given (Line 61-62) but school demographics are not described.
   d. How were focus groups recruited? How many total parents participated, and what were their demographics? Were all recruited schools represented in these focus groups? What percentage were Spanish-speaking?
   e. How were the key informant interview participants selected? Were all recruited schools represented by the seven parents and seven schools nurses who were interviewed?
   f. What measures were taken to ensure that meaning(s) were not changed/lost in the Spanish translations/English conversions of focus groups discussions, key informant interviews, survey?
   g. A logistic regression model was used to assess predictors of chronic disease reporting compliance. However, random sampling was not used; rather recruitment was by group (school) with analysis at the parent level. Hence, a generalized linear mixed effects model with random effect due to school would be a more appropriate statistical approach.

3. Results Section.
   a. A total of 283 parent surveys were collected. What was your response rate?
   b. How do parent survey participant demographics compare to CPS demographics? Could be shown in Table 2.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Line 178. The word “of” should be removed.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Lines 32-33. It would be helpful to include a brief explanation of how/when the message in Figure 1 is delivered to parents.
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