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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this well-written paper. Although negative, the findings are interesting. Nevertheless, the study is hampered both by being underpowered and likely residual confounding, as the authors outline.

Some minor points to highlight:

* I am confused by the use of the term 'cluster randomised' in the title (p1). This is not used elsewhere in the article, nor indeed in the protocol. Given the unit of analysis is childcare centres, not individual children attending those centres, I would suggest removing the term.

* For the international reader, please could you provide a bit more information about what you mean by 'centre based childcare' - in the UK, I think we would call this a nursery (p3)?

* Linked to this, it would be useful to have a little more detail on how you identified the 366 centres eligible for inclusion, particularly as I think government-run centres were excluded (p6).

* Could you also explain the role of Hunter New England Population Health (p6)? Are they a government body?
* In the section on implementation intervention (p7), it would be helpful if you could include a clear sentence which outlines what the intervention is. As you were seeking to implement and evaluate an intervention that in turn seeks to augment the implementation of public health policies, this reader got a bit confused on first reading!

* In the outcomes section of the methods (p11), you mention that 12 items were used to assess the implementation of the policies. However, only 6 are listed?
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