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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is an excellent paper describing in detail how a public health campaign based upon the prede-proceed model was conducted. It is comprehensive, exceptionally well written and documents how a positive impact was achieved for an intervention where there is a high level of sceptism in the field as to the impact of such programmes. As there are no word limits, the paper would benefit from more detail in the data sections. The outcome data is pending - should the paper be delayed in order to include these so the whole body of work is complete?

---------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

I would recommend more detail in the data sections. For example 93% of performance indicators achieved - what were they? Only data where sig effexcts were shown are reported but the non-sig data would also be useful - particularly if Compass strategy was replicated elsewhere and this is the one comprehensive description of the strategy.

What is the rational for providing a thorough review of the programme without the outcomes data?

Where was the comparison region - would benefit from a description

---------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Background para one line 9 - reiteration 'applied'

---------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interests'