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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and providing these useful comments. We have addressed your comments accordingly below.

Response to the Editor’s Comments:
1. Please include a Title page. The title page should present the title, list the full names, institutional addresses and email addresses for all authors and indicate the corresponding author.
   • We have added the title page on pg. 1-2 of the revised manuscript.
2. On uploading your revisions, please remove any note, tracked changes or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript.
   • We have removed notes, tracked changes and highlights in the revised manuscript.
3. Under the heading "Funding", please declare the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
   • Please see pg. 26 of the revised manuscript where we have added the required information.
4. Please remove the response to the reviewers from the supplementary material.
5. In "Ethics and Consent to participate", please include a statement about obtaining consent from the participants and clarify whether this was written or verbal. 
   • We have included a statement about obtaining written consent from participants on pg. 25 of the revised manuscript.

6. Since your manuscript does not present any sensitive information, consent for publication is not required. Therefore, you can state "Not applicable" under "Consent for publication". 
   • We have done so accordingly, please see pg. 25 of the revised manuscript.

7. Please carefully proofread your manuscript to address any possible English mistake. 
   • We have done so before submitting our revised manuscript.

Response to Reviewer 1’s Comments (anonymous)

8. Overall a really well written paper, describing an ambitious programme of work - specifically dealing with the implementation issues, which were clearly many. The authors did a good job of clearly describing this complexity and some of the steps taken to adapt, yet remain aligned with the study protocol. 
   • We thank the reviewer for these encouraging comments. We were mindful about highlighting the complexity of the program’s characteristics and related implementation.

9. A key missing element is a description of why this was done given the comments on page 19 about differentiation and improvement on the existing programs (HPB and MoH). The background and discussion should include justification for undertaking this work - why this is better than or complementing the existing systems. 
   • Thank you for pointing that out. We have added the background behind undertaking the program, on pg. 8 (3rd paragraph), and the implications for differentiating the program on pg. 23 of the revised manuscript.

10. Given the unique nature of Singaporean structures, and noting the value in describing this work in the detail provided, wondering how generalizable this work is to implementation research more broadly, especially as one strong take-away was that the success of the project relied heavily on individual personalities and cultural capital in "face-saving". 
    • These findings are especially transferable to Asian contexts similar to Singapore, and to others where local leaders are known to be key influencers. As such, our analysis highlights the need for programs to invest in well-liked figures who can build rapport with the community, to help promote the program in the initial stage of implementation. These local figures exist in many communities, and are sometimes seen as the ‘gatekeepers’ providing access to beneficiaries. Likewise, public figures or opinion leaders (e.g. celebrities, charismatic program staff) can also be leveraged to promote the program. We have added this insight on pg. 21 of the revised manuscript.

11. The authors do not provide an estimate for numbers of individuals needed to achieve saturation for each of the 4 FGD target groups, but in the discussion say that the target sample sizes were achieved. 
    • Saturation at the top thematic level e.g. themes of 1) creating commitment toward the program, (2) coordination and resource allocation, and (3) collaborative program appraising and monitoring occurred by the 4th FGD. We have clarified that on pg. 12, first paragraph of the revised manuscript.
12. I am satisfied that you have addressed the substantive comments made by the reviewers.
13. There is inconsistency throughout with regard to the placing of punctuation after quotes, with, for example, (FGD4) sometimes coming before, sometimes after the full stop.
   • Thank you for highlighting that- we have corrected the inconsistency, by placing punctuation behind the reporting of the (FGD) throughout in the revised manuscript.
14. It is preferable in reporting qualitative findings to include more detail about whom each quote was from, e.g. (FGD4, senior manager, male) or (FGD2, volunteer, female).
   • We have added more detail about whom each quote is from (RC manager, program trainer etc.) in the revised manuscript. However, to ensure the confidentiality of the participant providing the quote, we exclude reporting his or her gender, especially since the study participants whom we recruited are familiar with one another.
15. On p16 (now p17), the last sentence of the first paragraph needs a full stop before it and would read better without the last comma.
   • Thank you for your careful review. We have added a full stop and removed the last comma of the last sentence of the first paragraph (see pg. 18 of the revised manuscript).
16. Also, on p16 (now p18), the first sentence of the second paragraph doesn't make sense. Later in the paragraph, "trough" should be "through" and your brackets need revision in the final sentence.
   • Thank you for highlighting these grammatical errors. We have corrected them on pg. 17 of the revised manuscript.
17. On p19 (now p21), not sure if "legalizing" is the word you were looking for in relation to cognitive participation? And in the final paragraph, it should be "outcomes" not "outcome".
   • Yes, that was our mistake, we mean to say ‘legitimizing’ rather than legalizing the intervention. We have corrected this at the top of pg. 21 of the revised manuscript.