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This paper has been strongly improved and comments from previous reviews well addressed. A few relatively modest recommendations are addressed here. Thank you for the opportunity to read and discuss this paper.

The abstract and paper are somewhat unclear and inconsistent with regard to the main objectives of the paper. The end of the background section states that, “This paper describes the protocols, design and the methodology of this intervention program.” To that end, the emphasis in the abstract on the sample size calculations may somewhat exceed the prominence in the intended description of the study. The research goals, while important to include after the background, may be better stated in prose with some descriptive text. Also, the discussion section is largely directed to the assessment of cvd events and risk factors (surveillance) in three paragraphs, followed by a discussion of the sample and overall population in one paragraph. A very clear set of objectives for the paper should be stated (maybe in a bit more detail than the current sentence)
followed by a clear adherence to those objectives in the abstract and paper outline and text.

The discussion of analysis plans to address individual v. group (family) level data should be moved to the statistical methods section. To The authors/editors might consider moving the evaluation section to after the description of the intervention components. Some questions remain regarding the planned statistical analyses. Many ways of analyzing data are described, with contingencies for continuous, dichotomous and event based data. While generally these analyses seem appropriate, the exact methods to be used and analyses performed are not stated. The specific analytical techniques might be omitted from this descriptive paper to be included in the reports of the results.

The Dietary Assessment section requires a few more details. How and when was the FFQ developed or adapted? The validation study mentioned should be described in full or cited if published (appropriate for another paper). The use of the term “interclass correlation coefficients” does not seem appropriate for what seems to be a test of reliability of the FFQ. Likely a correlation coefficient is appropriate.

Some small editorial and typographical issues to consider are as follows:
Page 4, second line under Secondary, an extra e is added to “especial”
Page 5, 4th paragraph, last line, recommend “. . .the hospital TO collect relevant data. . .” instead of “and.”
Page 5, Second to last line, recommend “. . .reproductive history and ASSESSMENT OF physical activity. . .”
Page 6, paragraph beginning with “Anthropometrical. . .” – replace with “Anthropometric”; last line recommend, “. . .weight in kilograms BY the square . . .” instead of “to.”
Page 9, line 10, “It include questions. . .” add an “s” after to make includes.
Page 11, first line under Dietary Interventions, replace “. . .conducted on a. . .” with “. . .conducted WITH a. . .”
Page 11, fourth and fifth line of public site section, “. . nutrition messages are written in A health newsletter. . .” (add the “a”)
Page 11, seventh line from the bottom – “nder” should be “under”? Not sure if “diaries” should be “dairy products.”
Page 12, seventh line in Schools section- “The interference . . .” might be better worded as “overlap” or “interface.”