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Author’s response to reviews:

18th August 2019

Dear Editors,

We thank the reviewers for their comments and respond below.
Reviewer 4:

I think that could be very useful for the reader of this manuscript to have more information about the results of PLA intervention. I understand that the results of the trials were published elsewhere. However, in order to better evaluate the PLA intervention, quantitative results should be considered together with qualitative results reported in this manuscript in the discussion.

We have added to the manuscript on page 5.

Setting

I think you have missed the acronym PE, please could you add it.

We did not miss the acronym as it appears first in the second paragraph of the whole article, however we have added PE to the setting as requested.

Reviewer 6:

Settings: You have explained upazillas twice; in line 18 and 19.

We have corrected this.

Results:

The paragraph: 'individual and group level mechanisms' mainly discuss group level mechanism. I do not think it is clear where the individual level is discussed under this paragraph?

To understand this heading, I think it would help the reader, if you make it more clear, or distinguish more clear between 'individual' and 'group' level mechanism.

We have edited the text and have added a quote which more clearly indicates individual level learning. The other quote is from a focus group discussion with group members. In the data, often a member talks on behalf of the group, and this is the reason that they talk in the ‘we’ instead of the ‘I’.

I do not think that the headline 'agency, resilience & changed social norms' covers the paragraph written below.

Further, should the paragraph 'community' and 'diet' not be joined. As I see it, the theme they have in common is: 'healthier eating habits.'
And will it not bee too wide to call the paragraph 'community,' when the description only covers "some local shops' who changed their assortment?

We used an ecological framework to analyse our results, and we found that groups identified household and community contexts that were changed as a result of the intervention. To name paragraphs as suggested by the reviewer would be to ignore the mechanisms and instead focus on the behaviour. We use examples (physical activity, diet) to demonstrate mechanism. We think that the reviewer perhaps missed reference to community changes around acceptability of smoking which are also included in the paragraph ‘community’.

Discussion: I think that L 11-23 is more of a conclusion than a discussion. I would suggest you put the short presentation of your main findings at the very beginning of the discussion.

We thank the reviewer for their suggestion. We have detailed (in the first paragraph of the discussion) a reminder of the purpose and context of the paper, as a lead-in to the short description of results, which follows in the second paragraph. We think that after such a long presentation of results, it is useful to the reader to be brought back to the paper purpose which is then discussed.

We look forward to hearing from you.