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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this manuscript is well written and a worthwhile read. The focus on a coaching intervention within the community has significant merit given the high possibility of translation into practice in future. The strengths and limitations are well balanced and provide direction for future work in this field, with just a few minor comments that I think could improve the manuscript.

INTRODUCTION
Succinctly written.

METHODS - AIMS - DATA COLLECTION
The authors state the primary aim to establish the feasibility and acceptability of the WTW intervention (P5 L58), however based on the data collection information (P7 L48-56) and results (P11) it appears that the recruitment aspect of feasibility has been assessed (and well discussed throughout the piece) but limited other aspects of feasibility or acceptability of the trial have been included. For example ...
- compliance of participants with intervention,
- dose delivered (Amount or number of intended units of each intervention)
- dose received such as exposure (Extents to which participants actively engage with, interact with, are receptive to, and/or use materials or recommended resources) or satisfaction (Satisfaction with program + Implementation)


The manuscript would benefit from the addition of some further information around acceptability and feasibility more broadly(if possible), and if not consideration or comment around how and whether acceptability and/or feasibility were sufficiently assessed based on recruitment data alone. Or what additional aspects may need to be considered in future to inform RCTs?
RESULTS

Primary Aim - see above comment regarding 'acceptability and feasibility' results

Secondary Aim
P12 L38-43 - Accelerometry data was collected for 4 days however due to missing data the final analysis was based on only 3 days. There is no mention of if/how the authors believe this may have impacted the results and/or whether this is considered methodologically appropriate.

Table 2 P12
Following on from the activity data above, in table 2 the follow up data is presented on n=21. However I am unable to determine (apologies if I have missed it) why only n=21 analysed for the activity and the number in control/intervention? P11 L27 reports follow up data for 33 participants and this is matched in Figure 1, and there is mention of 2 not wearing accelerometers. If n=21 with only 3 days of data and depending on group allocation, it would be worth considering whether the follow up data is sufficiently robust to draw any solid conclusions.

P13 L32 - Authors note that intervention group had significantly higher light PA, and they also had higher TOTAL PA (approaching significance) ... what impact (if any) did this potentially have any impact on outcomes?

DISCUSSION

Well written with regards to results presented and also well considered future considerations around clinical and research implications.
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