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Dear Editor,

Thank you for inviting us to resubmit our manuscript ‘Implementing a free school-based fruit and vegetable programme: Barriers and facilitators experienced by pupils, teachers and produce suppliers in the Boost study’ (MS: 2121446465103283).

We would also like to thank the reviewers, for providing constructive and interesting suggestions to the manuscript.

Please find attached our specific responses to the reviewer’s comments. We have highlighted the changes in the manuscript.

All authors have approved the revision

Yours sincerely

Anne Kristine Aarestrup (for all authors)
RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS FROM REVIEWER 1:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

Comment #1: Background: Need to provide a rationale for consumption of fruit and vegetables among adolescents.

Response: The rationale for adolescents to eat fruit and vegetables has been added in the background section as suggested (p.4)

Comment #2: Results and discussion: Provide findings and discuss any implications for question 1 from the pupils' focus group interview: Do you bring FV to school from home and have you changed that practice after the Boost FV programme has been introduced in your class?

If the students substituted bringing FV from home with the supplied FV did not increase the level eaten and so the free school-based fruit and vegetable programme was not effective in boosting overall consumption.

Response: We agree that the topic concerning whether the pupils changed the practice of bringing FV themselves to school after they got a FV programme in school is important. My focus in this manuscript is though on process evaluation and dose received of the intervention and not the overall effect of the intervention on pupils' FV intake. This topic will be addressed in future articles focusing on the effect evaluation.

Minor Essential Revisions:

Comments inserted in the manuscript:

Comment #1: The suggested sentence has been reworded (p.2)

Comment #2: A sentence on why it is important for adolescents to eat the recommended amount of FV has been included as suggested (p.4)

Comment #3: The recommended word has been removed (p.4)

Comment #4: The suggested sentence has been reworded (p.8)

Comment #5: The suggested word was corrected (p.8)

Comment #6: As suggested, the sequence of the sentence was changed (p.10).

RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS FROM REVIEWER 2:

Comment #1: Data analysis needs to be better illustrated. A thematic map/figure is recommended in order to clarify the process of analysis.
Response: We have clarified the process of analysis by including further description on p.11-12.

Comment #2: An additional aim seems suddenly to appear (to report “variation in intervention reached”, in the result part, the first introducing paragraph, the last sentence). That was not originally presented as a study aim!!??

Response: We agree that the aim of exploring the ways in which the intervention was implemented (reach is only one element of the implementation we look at), was not originally stated clearly as an aim. This has now been clarified in the abstract (p.2), in the background section (p.5) and the results section (p.13).

Comment #3:

The result part needs major compulsory revisions in terms of being more processed/condensed. To me as a reader it is not clear and obvious what you found as barriers and facilitators. I have to read your results over and over again before grasping your message. An attached thematic map/figure might clarify the coming results and the readability would improve if the results are divided under the heading Barriers and Facilitators. Furthermore, start with the summary of your results under each heading. Now the summary comes in the end.

Response:

To meet the reviewer’s relevant recommendations we have included a figure (figure 4) clarifying and summarizing the results concerning barriers and facilitators for implementation. This figure has been placed at the beginning of the result section to meet the reviewer’s suggestion of giving an overview at the beginning.

Comment #4:

A question: Children throwing FV isn’t that a discipline problem, and a barrier to the availability?

Response:

We agree that children throwing with FV is a discipline problem and related to age. In the manuscript we address how this misbehaviour became a barrier for FV availability. On page 20 we state that pupils throwing FV affects implementation and specifically dose received as the pupils throw the FV instead of eating it: ‘The throwing of FV had an impact on the implementation by affecting 1) fidelity and dose delivered of the pleasant eating environment component as some teachers made more restrictions resulting in less pupil involvement and 2) dose received of the free FV as the pupils rejected the thrown FV.’

Comment #5:

Revision of the discussion part: present and select the main findings of the study and concentrate the discussion to the selected main findings.
Response:

In the discussion section we summarize the main findings of identified barriers and facilitators in the beginning. We then discuss the main findings according to the programme theory and specific proximal outcomes the intervention was designed to address. This approach was chosen to address the assumptions of the programme theory i.e. to explore whether changing the proximal outcomes of the intervention components was challenged by inadequate implementation and what was barriers and facilitators.

This structure has now been clarified in the beginning of the discussion section in the manuscript.

Comment #6: The above revisions suggested demands a review of study conclusion and abstract.

Response:

The study conclusion and abstract was reviewed and changed according to the revisions of the manuscript.