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Reviewer's report:

This is a very interesting and very well written article that has important implications for preventive services in general, I congratulate the authors. I have no major compulsory or minor essential revisions to suggest, but some comments that might lead to small discretionary revisions.

In some ways, we in public health are catching up with the pharmaceutical industry, who have 'drug detailing' a bit like this for decades, because it is effective. Some are now doing this with 'responsible prescribing' or 'academic detailing' (see http://www.cshp-bc.com/events/2011/interior/CSHP%20Interior%20Chapter%202011%20Spring.pdf or even 'public health detailing' - see http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1525275/

A linkage between the lessons learned here and the lessons learned in these other pro-health detailing approaches might be useful and interesting all round.

I would think a useful policy recommendation would be that governments stop constantly reorganizing CCs (and other public services), it is clearly very disruptive and does harm to clients by reducing effectiveness, as shown here!

A couple of points re Box 6:
- In item 3 of Key Findings, it should be 'combining', not 'combing'
- In point 4 of implications, based on the comments in the article and interviews, I would say 'external agencies, ESPECIALLY the local Fire and Rescue Services'.

A couple of small points:
- A simple statistical analysis of Figure 1 would enable you to tell us whether the differences are statistically significant, it certainly looks as if they would be.
- FRS is missing from the list of abbreviations

Minor grammar and typo issues:
- Line 219: "fire safety activities AND these were . . ."

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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