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Reviewer’s report:

This reviewer read the manuscript “Process Evaluation Outcomes from a Global Child Obesity Prevention Intervention”.

Despite some interesting systematization of econological intervention, the introduction is ambiguous. For example in the abstract the research question was addressed as follows: “The survey items asked respondents to comment on those aspects of program implementation that they found challenging”. It looks that researcher were not searching for specific critical aspects.

In page 5, I read “Given the diverse factors that contribute to obesogenic environments, interventions seeking to address child obesity need to operate at multiple ecological levels”. I believe that ecological models deserve a critical and systematic overview. Authors have just mention the categories downstream, midstream and upstream.

I also suggest to add more information from the meta-analyses that were mentioned (references 28, 29, 30, 31) but not critically interpreted by the authors.

Although somewhat long (8 paragraphs), the background is generic and did not really address a concise question.

What is the novelty taking into account previous studies? What authors really expeted from an open questionnaire? Without answering this questions, I do not antecipate that potential readers will develop an interest on this manuscript.

The final paragraph adds very litte and the manuscript finished in the starting point with a very generalistic sentence:

“In conclusion, the present study provides insight into implementation issues relevant to a child obesity prevention program. The findings have the potential to be of broader relevance given the increasing need for multi-level, comprehensive interventions to address non communicable diseases and their multi-factorial causes. The findings illustrate the importance of ensuring that program staff members have ready access to best practice information about intervention strategies and evaluation measures in user-friendly formats. The provision of advice and assistance relating to establishing and maintaining relationships with funding bodies is also likely to be of particular value”.
In summary, I believe that a shorter version with a more informative introduction regarding the essentials of the past literature and the fundamentals of the EPODE methodology, combined with a more intentional and concise organization of the question and respective results may improve the manuscript. Actually, I noted for several times interesting notes about cultural variations of the respondents (Easter Europe, Ásia, South America) and this particular aspect would be relevant to gain more visibility.
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