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Reviewer's report:

This study describes barriers and facilitators from different stakeholder groups in the implementation of a lifestyle intervention in the construction industry. The methodology used is qualitative research by using interviews and focus groups. Based on the results, suggestions can be made to improve the implementation of the intervention on different levels.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. In the introduction, we can read that there is already a process evaluation performed for this intervention (reference 18. Groeneveld IF, et al. 2011). Can the authors in the research question at the end of the introduction, state more clear what the added value is of their research (other target group? Other methodology?)? Or can the authors indicate more clear in which phase their research is situated compared with the previous process evaluation (f.e. process evaluation situated in ideal situation in the evaluation phase of the intervention, this research in real life situation)?

2. Methods lines 119-120: there is research on barriers and facilitators to participation and implementation of lifestyle interventions. There is even a whole journal dedicated to this topic (see Implementation Science). When not much research is found, researchers can also use theory as basis for their study (see f.e. Downey AM & Sharp DJ, Health Promotion International, 22(2), 2007 using the Theory of Planned Behaviour). This is something I miss in this paper: theory, what is already know about barriers and facilitators, …

3. Methods lines 156-158: Same remark as 2. Here is stated that previous research already revealed some barriers and facilitators (mentioned by professionals and by employees). Was theory used in this research to capture these determinants? How can you be sure that there are no barriers or facilitators missing?

4. Methods lines 174-175: What was the basis for the topic list?

5. Discussion: limitations: Was there saturation of information in the interviews of the employees, OP’s and medical assistants? Did this research succeeded to capture most of the barriers and facilitators?

6. Discussion lines 581-582: The authors indicate that one of the limitation is that the sample of employees was not selected based on their CVD risk. Besides that this makes your group more heterogeneous in risk perception and lifestyle, I also see another limitation. When people got the diagnosis of being at risk for
something, they can react differently compared with when they are in the hypothetical situation of being diagnosed (like in this study). They can fight or they can flee. This is something that is not captured in this study. Other barriers and facilitators can pop up when they are actually in this (sometimes life threatening) situation.

For the other stakeholders, this hypothetical situation is less important as they are not/ less emotionally involved.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Is Arbouw a commercial institute or is it a governmental institute (like a general institute coordinating all occupation health services)? If it is the first, it would be better to make this institute anonymous.

2. Methods line 127-128: Did the Medical Ethics Committee give a reason why ethical approval is not necessary?
   
   Table 2:
   Indicate in the footnote: F = facilitator, B = barrier; instead of with numbers. Or put footnote 3 at the first barrier and not at the second.
   
   Attachment:
   
   See comment 1, minor essential revisions.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Line 182: The interviews with the medical assistants lasted on average 25 minutes; ...

2. Line 302: weighing scale.
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