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Reviewer's report:

General
Effects of a community-based healthy heart program on increasing healthy women's physical activity: a randomized controlled trial guided by Community-based Participatory Research (CBPR) by Raha Pazoki, Iraj Nabipour, Nasrin Seyednezami and Seyed Reza Imami

This manuscript addresses an important international public health topic, namely cardiovascular disease prevention among women. This manuscript was well-written and had many strengths, including an informed intervention, based on input from community advisors, the inclusion of blood pressure, lipids, and the implementation of a program from a reputable organization, the American Heart Association. Another strength of this study is the mention of Su Corazon outreach program in the discussion section, which helps to put the current findings in context.

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

Although there are a number of strengths of the manuscript, there are several points that need to be addressed:

1) It is unclear how exactly the participants were recruited, as there are different figures in the manuscript. For instance, on page 6, 570 women were informed about the study, yet no information is provided as to how many women declined or did not respond to information about the study. In addition, on page 8, it states that 589 women were surveyed and 109 were excluded. Why is there a discrepancy? What were the reasons for exclusion?

2) The description of the integration of the volunteers as part of the intervention delivery was unclear. It is stated that “each trainer covered five subjects”, but when did the trainer meet with the participants? Was this in a group, or individual format? How often did the trainer meet with participants? Was this all done in person, or was some contact done via mail or telephone? How many contacts did each participant have with a trained volunteer?

3) The intervention that was delivered was based on Choose to Move and had the added component of in-person contact with lay health educators. The authors need to be very careful to explain their modifications to this program in the discussion section, as it is not a true test of the CTM program, which was designed to be delivered in a self-help format, without in-person supplementation

4) In the discussion section, the authors have misrepresented the design of the Napolitano, et al (2006) investigation, which did, in fact, include a control group. The Napolitano et al (2006) trial was a three arm study (CTM vs. Jumpstart vs. Control).

5) Other limitations should be mentioned in the discussion section, such the reliance on self-report data, and the lack of a more objective measure of physical activity and/or fitness.

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

There were a few typographical errors. An additional proofreading of this manuscript would be helpful.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

n/a

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: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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