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Reviewer’s report:

On page 1, under "Methods," HADS should be defined on the first mention of it in the article.

On page 7, MRC is spelled out, but it should have been spelled out at the first mention in the article: in the abstract and on page 3.

On page 9, you mention the "secondary prevention of cardiovascular disease." Why isn’t this mentioned in the abstract and sooner in the article? I think it would add to the importance of the study to identify this secondary benefit.

Overall, I found this to be an informative article and enjoyable to read. This is valuable information that was obtained from your study. Once it is published, I look forward to sharing it with colleagues and others interested in socio-economic impacts on health, prevention and wellness. The use of pre-existing groups for your intervention was a brilliant approach. I believe this approach could be utilized for other interventions seeking to overcome barriers to individuals engaging in their own health and wellness and further encourage them to take personal ownership.
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