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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a very thorough and articulate paper that documents an evaluation of the factors that facilitate or impede the implementation of the interesting, efficacious Coaching on Lifestyle intervention. On the whole, the methodology and findings of the evaluation is described precisely and transparently, and the use of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation is appropriate in this context. The introduction sets the context for the evaluation very well and the authors discussion and conclusions are informative, providing useful recommendations for future practice based on the findings. There are only a handful on minor comments, which I feel might add clarity or value to what I feel is on the whole a very good manuscript.
REQUESTED REVISIONS:
I have a few minor comments that I feel if addressed would enhance the readability of the paper:

P2L56: the second sentence on prevalence of obesity/overweight in children, do the statistics reflect the increase or the current prevalence? It is hard to tell the way the sentence is written and if it is a rise from (rather than to) 13.3 and 2.8%, we need to know the timeframe.

P2L57: I would recommend writing that CLI's 'aim to help' rather than 'help' as I'm not sure there is unequivocal proof of there effectiveness.

P3L71: I find the term 'bottlenecks' a bit ambiguous - I think we either need examples of what the bottlenecks are, or change to something clearer (is it the different lifestyle factors you target such as physical activity, diet, stress management and so on...?)

P3L79: It would be helpful to cite the self-determination theory literature supporting the use of autonomy-supportive coaching style.

P3L83: The use of the phrase 'novel professional' also seems strange. I think you mean it is not an established role in primary care?

P4L129: I could not entirely follow the process and implications of the change in project leaders role. Do you mean that the person who project lead left and the main researcher became the project lead? I'd suggest rewording for clarity.

P5L146: The reader would benefit from an explicit definition and citation around what you mean by 'action-oriented study'.

P5L158: Some examples of the types of questions you asked of the various stakeholders, participants and coaches would also be beneficial to explain what the theory informed interview structures looked like.

P6L169: The title of your table should include reference to the CFIR. (...each domain of the Consolidated Fra...)

P6L191: Please expand or provide examples of the 'coaching skills' that were referenced - this is currently a bit to vague to be of any relevance.

P7L197 (and P8L229) I think in the context that you are describing the evaluation, revealing that the coaches were a 'her' is unnecessary. Stick to 'they'.

P7L216: This is a general musing rather than a critique - were the health insurers considered a stakeholder in this intervention? I ask as you may wish to comment on the importance of them funding it in the discussion and whether this integral factor is sustainable for wide spread roll out of such a programme...

P8L238: It isn't clear what an 'intake session' is - could this be expanded on.
P9L263: How was motivation defined in this context? It reads as if the construct described might be a lack of intention/desire to participate? Again could be clarified.

P9L271: Is there evidence to support the lack of priority in 'multi-problem' families? Or is this a finding of your study (not clear)?

P10L301: Could you expand on what you mean by 'relatively dense networks'?

P10L318: I wasn't sure having read this line whether the contribution to the programme was perceived or measured - the first line suggests perceived ('saw themselves as') where as the second line states that they were relatively active suggesting measured.

P10L323-326: I couldn't quite work out what the percentages mean here in the context of a 5 point Likert scale...?

P12L385: Could you give some examples of 'special needs' in this context?

P12L387-390: some examples of what the participants did and how they felt about the existing assignments or activities would be useful here to demonstrate what they would like have these alternatives instead of.

P13L422: What is the difference between professional knowledge and expertise in this sentence - some examples could help distinguish.

P15L480: This paragraph is a little vague - what is meant by 'create support' - get them to engage with the programme?

P15L487: I wasn't sure if this last line referencing motivational interviewing was something the coaches in CooL did or a suggestion you are making. Please clarify. I feel like this discussion on the importance of behavioural theory could be developed and discussed more in the context of what was achieved in your intervention/how it influenced implementation.

P16L508: I'm not sure that not using NVivo is necessarily a limitation: you could describe how you set out to ensure trustworthiness in the qualitative data here and be clearer about why, in your opinion, a pen and paper method hampered that process.

Table 1 title: Could you provide the full title of the consolidated framework rather than the acronym.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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