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"Implementation of health promotion programmes in schools:
An approach to understand the influence of contextual factors on the process?"

Dear Editor,

we are pleased to send you our revised manuscript. We are delighted and honoured it “is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Public Health”, once we “have carried out some essential revisions suggested by [the] reviewers and some editorial revisions.”

We have now revised the paper based on your suggestions and the constructive responses from Reviewer #4. The various comments have been considered carefully. Detailed responses to individual reviewer concerns are listed below. We believe they have greatly improved the manuscript.

As stated at the time of initial submission, the manuscript is the results of our own original research, which has been submitted only to BMC PH and is not under consideration or peer review or accepted for publication or in press or published by any other journal. The manuscript
does not duplicate any other previously published work, including our own previously published work. The main body of text in the revised manuscript contains 8346 words.

The authors are Emily Darlington, Nolwenn Violon, and Didier Jourdan. All authors have read and approved the final version.

We confirm that all author details on the revised version are correct, that all authors have agreed to authorship and order of authorship for this manuscript and that all authors have the appropriate permissions and rights to the reported data.

Yours sincerely,

The authors

Responses to comments

Editorial comments:

1. Please upload a clean version of the manuscript without tracked changes.

A clean version was uploaded.

2. In the Ethics approval and consent to participate could you please clarify if parental consent was written or oral? We would also ask that you clarify if consent was informed.

an addition was made to this section:

« Parents gave their written informed consent for their children’s participation in the research (data collection using questionnaires) ».

As for children’s participation to regular classroom activities, no consent was needed from the parents, as the research focused on teachers’ practices.
3. In the Funding section could you please clarify which local bodies provided funding.

An addition was made to this section: “educational district in the Ile de France region”. This addition was made to ensure the anonymity of participants.

4. Please include figure legends after the Declarations.

Figure legends were moved after the declarations, so was the title for Figure 1. We hope we understood the change you requested correctly.

5. We recommend that you ask a native English speaking colleague to help you copyedit the paper.

A native speaking colleague copy-edited and proofread the paper.

Comments from reviewers:

Louisa Peralta (Reviewer 2): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

thank you for accepting our manuscript for publication

Sara Kirk (Reviewer 4): This manuscript is much improved and the authors have addressed reviewer feedback well.

Thank you for your kind comment.
The manuscript is lengthy, and in particular, the introduction would benefit from editing to be more concise and focused.

The introduction was shortened and synthesized to highlight our arguments and emphasize the focus of this work.

As it is, the lengthy introduction risks losing the reader and it needs to be more clearly stated at the start what the research intended to do.

The following section was altered and moved to the beginning of the article:

“In order to scale up the design of strategies and programmes, especially in school settings, it seems relevant to better understand the stakes involved in health promotion programme implementation. This work is a contribution to existing implementation research in the field of health promotion. The purpose of this research is to build knowledge on the processes at play during programme implementation, and the critical conditions and factors which influence such processes, based on existing literature as well as empirical research.”

The manuscript was shortened by approx. a thousand words. Some of the text was transferred to 2 additional files

- The presentation of the different stages of implementation of the programme was moved to additional file 1 – “Programme implementation design”

- The detailed protocol for data analysis was moved to additional file 2

Some of the text was moved to endnotes “i In the QUAL/quan approach, the set of quantitative data has a supportive and secondary role to provide additional information to the main set of data, in this case the set of qualitative data. The broader research project involved statistical analysis of the quantitative data which shall not be presented here.”
There remain some errors in grammar, tense and syntax that should be corrected, for example the first sentence "When children's health is considered in a holistic perspective" should read "When children's health is considered FROM a holistic perspective". With edits to improve flow and shorten the manuscript I would be comfortable with it being accepted for publication.

The first sentence was altered.

The manuscript was proofread and copy-edited. We hope this improved the flow and clarity of our text.

Thank you for your valuable comments, which we feel improved our manuscript.