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Reviewer's report:

The authors presented an interesting, relevant and current study regarding the experiences and expectations of EPODE programs around the world. As the author’s said the EPODE is a unique example of a comprehensive, sustained approach that operates at multiple ecological levels to influence a wide variety factors impacting children’s health. More particularly, the EPODE is an ecological approach with the main purpose to prevent childhood obesity. I believe that information gained from this approach may be useful in strategies and programs designed to prevent childhood obesity. Notwithstanding, there are some issues that must be addressed in order to improve the quality of the paper.

Although the manuscript is well written, it might benefit from the following major compulsory revision:

- The abstract does not adequately describe the purpose of the study. I believe that for BMC Public Health journal readers is not enough to say that the main purpose of the study is to provide process evaluation data relating to the experiences of groups implementing the EPODE approach to child obesity prevention in various locations around the world. The authors need to better describe the purpose of the study.

- The background is a little bit confusing and does not clearly extend existing knowledge regarding the efficacy of child obesity interventions. The authors’ said that child obesity interventions that cross multiple ecological levels are rare. However, several studies have been conducted with the same purpose. The authors’ also said that the qualitative survey results reported in this article were built on a previous analysis of preliminary EPODE process evaluation data. However, no findings or comments about previous results were presented. The used references are adequate and relevant.

- Some important information appears to be presently omitted from the methods section. The survey comprised questions relating to experiences with implementing the EPODE approach, the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the programs as they are delivered on the ground, and any need for additional support. I can imagine that the survey has different questions and domains. For that reason a further description of the survey would be helpful for the reader. Who collected the data? Was the time of year and season consistent for all members of EIN? The authors’ also need to explain better how was analyzed the
study results. The data was only qualitative or also quantitative? How was assessed the reliability of the data? Please explain better these points.

- The results and discussion sections are a little bit confused and need to be clarified according the questions and probably the different domains that were assessed.
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