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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for your request for a tracked document. When revising the document, we worked across multiple documents, and unfortunately, do not have one document with all the tracked changes. We have therefore shared a file with some of the tracked changes, and highlighted ones that were merged from another document.

Additionally, please see the below changes for a detailed account of the revisions:

We would like to thank the reviewers for their thoughtful comments. We have restructured our manuscript considerably with their guidance. The manuscript now is focused on assessing community readiness as an important part of the dissemination science process. In the new iteration, the manuscript is not intended to be used as a toolkit, but as rather as to an approach to enhance the evaluation of community readiness to adopt an evidence-based approach to obesity programming.

We enhanced the background with an updated literature review to help ground the argument in the field of both implementation and dissemination research as well as childhood obesity prevention research. In our background, we explicated organizational readiness, making a clearer argument for this focus.

We revised the methods section to detail the specific CFIR constructs that we used. We added additional information with regards to the purpose of both surveys and interviews and revised the codebook to include a crosswalk of the CFIR constructs. We additionally added detail to
describe how the survey and the interviews were analyzed together to co-inform the findings. We explain that the surveys provide quantitative measures and the interviews provide qualitative measures. In the revisions, we included a more detailed discussion of how our constructs relate and contribute to the CFIR constructs: we shared how our inductive methods of data analysis, analyzing what elements were critical when the CFIR was applied within the community setting. Moreover, we provided greater detail with regards to determining whether an organization/community is ready for implementation.

We thank the reviewers for their detailed and instructive feedback. In addition to these significant revisions, we have also addressed the minor concerns, detailed below.

Minor Concerns:

• The title of the paper is a theory driven toolkit to implement behavioral interventions in community settings. After reading the paper, I believe a more appropriate title would be "development of a theory driven toolkit to assess organizational and community readiness to implement behavioral interventions". I believe this title more accurately reflects this research, as this research is (from my read) focused on assessing readiness so that organizations can make decisions about adoption and prepare for implementation, not implementation strategies or assessments to facilitate implementation.

We have revised the title of the paper as it aligns with our revisions to focus on a feasibility report and not a toolkit.

• There is a typo in the abstract on line 20 - there are two periods at the end of the following sentence: "We conducted a mixed methods pre-implementation evaluation using the CFIR to evaluate the alignment of these local community centers with the Healthier Families program."

We made this edit.

• Assessment of community readiness should be described in the methods portion of the abstract; the authors should note that the interviews were conducted with staff to assess organizational readiness and with community members to assess community readiness.

We included this information.
On page 5, line 50, the authors state "the purpose of this study was do adapt Salud con la familia so that it could then be adopted…". I would recommend replacing "adapt" with another term. I do not believe the focus of this research was to adapt this intervention, but rather to do what is stated in the next sentence (assess organizational/community readiness).

Thank you for this comment. We do not mean adapt, but rather adopt, as in disseminate to different communities.

On page 5, line 67, the authors state "our survey and interview instruments were aligned to the CFIR constructs: intervention characteristics, outer setting, inner setting…". Intervention characteristics, outer/inner setting, etc. are not CFIR constructs, these are domains. I would recommend revising this sentence to read "instruments were aligned with CFIR constructs within each of the CFIR's 5 domains" (if instruments assessed constructs from each of the 5 domains).

Thank you for this attention to detail. We have made this change and reviewed the rest of the article to ensure proper terminology.

Reviewer #2: I enjoyed reviewing this manuscript. In the main, this is well written and does managed to focus (to some extent) on quite a novel approach to accessing key stakeholder assessment, opinion and perspectives before implementation of a prospective community-based childhood obesity prevention programme.

More specific elements for adjusting and considering are as follows:

TITLE

• Theory-driven toolkit?...after reading this article I'm not sure this piece of work eludes to a 'toolkit' as such. There is little precision and detail with simple referral to previous authors of the CFIR and little attention is paid to the survey instrument utilised……This article refers to reporting the early stages of assessment of feasibility in multiple areas which is perfectly fine to publish - but this should be the focus given the data contained and the emphasis of the purpose on page 5, line 50. It is likely the title needs to change…. Perhaps 'Early assessment and opportunity in the Healthier Families Program; use of a CFIR for guiding intervention development and suitability/capability' would be more appropriate (or along those lines).

We agree with your assessment and suggestions and have revised the title accordingly.
ABSTRACT:

• Background: First sentence is awkward and not necessary. Reform or remove.

We agree with your suggestion and removed this sentence.

• Methods: Excessive use of 'we' - state what happened directly; "a survey was conducted with x" or "X semi-structured interviews were conducted with"

Thank you for your attention to this. We have revised according to your recommendations.

• Methods: Include the type of qualitative methods used to analyse the data.

We have included specifics.

• Conclusion: remove the gap between 'explicitly' and 'translates'

We have addresses this concern.

• Conclusion: First sentence is awkward. Reform content, possibly two sentences instead.

We have simplified this sentence.

• Conclusion: Needs to address the decision made where the areas were accepted or rejected based on the mixed-method results. No indication of this is given here.

We have added this information.

BACKGROUND:

• General comment: Referencing style in the main text here is incorrectly presented. Full stops must occur after the use of brackets

We have revised accordingly.
• General comment: I don't feel that there is enough justification and literature attached to this early part to really outline why you should study this area. The literature and reference list has scope to include further authors. You should try and improve the connection with what you are doing and the literature in the area. I disagree with the statement in Line 33 of page 4 claiming "the field of implementation science for these behavioural interventions is nascent". It possibly was 7 years ago, the references used here to support this statement are dated and since then there has been a plethora of implementation work on childhood/obesity prevention programmes. See Van Der Kleij, R. and associated authors in recent years. Specifically, Van Der Kleij, R. M., Crone, M. R., Paulussen, T. G., van de Gaar, V. M., & Reis, R. (2015). A stitch in time saves nine? A repeated cross-sectional case study on the implementation of the intersectoral community approach Youth At a Healthy Weight. BMC Public Health, 15(1), 1032. AND Van der Kleij, R. M. J. J., Crone, M. R., Reis, R., & Paulussen, T. G. W. M. (2016). Critical stakeholder determinants to the implementation of intersectoral community approaches targeting childhood obesity. Health Education Research, 31(6), 697-715.

Thank you for this suggestion. We have revised accordingly.

• Line 22, page 3: remove the word 'toolkit' - limited outline of the tools necessary to conduct this. The start of this sentence needs to be reformed.

We made this edit.

• Line 29, page 4: obesity stats need references and dating

We included this information.

• Line 44 - 45, page 4: 'leveraging the strengths of the built environment'…?....what does mean? - this needs either exploring or a less dramatic outline.

We edited this sentence

• Line 50 - 51: Now, if this is the real purpose then this should be reflective in the title?

We have revised our title accordingly.
• Line 55: another mention of a 'toolkit'

We revised this sentence.

METHOD:

• Initial section requires a suitable sub-heading - Design, recruitment and ethics?

Thank you for this suggestion, we added the subheading ‘design.’

• Line 63/65, page 5: use of ‘we’ - write directly.

We have revised these sentences.

• Lines 77, page 6: How many parks and rec centres expressed interest? ....how many were followed up with phone calls? ....and how many accepted participation? ......needs to be detailed explicitly.

Thank you for these details. We have included additional detail in our revisions to include greater specifics regarding identification of partner sites.

• Line 81, page 6: delete the word 'possible'

We made this edit.

• Line 87 - 88: How many staff were eligible? ....how many were included and perhaps how many ineligible for what reason? To enhance precision, you should report age, and gender of the participants here, at least.

All staff were eligible to participate. All who expressed interest had the opportunity to participate.

• Line 96, page 7: a summarised score from the questionnaire is possible and should be used a long side the average score.
We added this information.

- Lines 99 - 100, page 7: How many staff members were interviewed from the ones which were invited?... To enhance precision, you should report age, and gender of the participants here, at least.

We added additional detail and data on the interview participants.

- Line 123: delete 'we'

We made this edit.

RESULTS:

- General comment: This section should have sub headings. Perhaps 'Survey results' and 'Interview Data'

Thank you for this suggest, we have made revised the manuscript accordingly.

- Line 154: recruited participants should occur earlier it the document; Methods.

We have made this edit to move this section from the results to the methods.

- Page 18: the final section in the results should form part of the discussion

Thank you for this suggestion, we have moved this section.

DISCUSSION:

- Lines 388 - 390, page 19: the final sentence could be better prepared and possibly without the words 'as' and 'we'

Thank you for this suggestion, we have revised accordingly.
• Page 20, referencing errors - brackets, and full stop issue.
• We have addressed this error throughout the paper.

REFERENCES:
• The references need checking against the Journal's requested system.

We have addressed this throughout the paper.