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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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

None

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

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

1. Background, p 4, paragraph 1 to p 5. It would help to identify the second and third reasons with the words second and third. This will help the reader.

2. Results, p 12, paragraph 2. The authors report that 3 interventions (Excercise TV, Tasty and Healthy, and Focus on Heart and Sports) accounted for 45% of the total costs. Is there any way to examine the benefit of these 3 interventions in an effort to identify interventions that are most cost effective? I understand this may be difficult or impossible to do, but it would help if the authors would discuss this issue. Readers may think about this as I did.

3. Discussion, p 13, paragraph 1, last sentence. How can cost sharing be applied by other programs? It would help if the authors could briefly address this issue.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.