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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper, which can provide useful insights and examples for regional/local public health monitoring in other countries. Nevertheless, the structure of the paper needs improvement.

Major compulsory revisions:

1) The paper has two objectives: to report on and to provide a follow-up review of the findings of the think tank Forum. In the methods and results section, only the first objective is addressed. It seems that the methods related to the follow-up review are being described in the 2nd paragraph of the discussion, but the information is so minimal, that it is hard to picture what exactly was done. This should be elaborated more. A lot of the information provided under discussion in fact seem to be results related to the 2nd objective of the paper. The structure of the paper should be improved taking into account the above.

2) At the end of the paper, it is stated that: "It is beneficial to relate CARRFS activities back to the recommendations of the think tank Forum which created CARFSS in the first place." From the paper however it does not become clear that such a comparison is being made. It would probably help if these activities were listed in the results section, and then clearly compared with the Forum’s recommendations.

Minor essential revisions:

1) It would be nice to have some background information on the development of the questions that were posed to the think tank Forum. What were they based on?

2) On page 12 a franchise model, a turnkey package and a global support system are mentioned as elements of a good practice example. It would be nice to have some more information on these elements, as now it remains quite abstract.

3) Page 15: reference to table 3: should be table 5.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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