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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper on a topic that I think will be of interest to the journal's readers. The literature review is comprehensive and the study methods and design are appropriate. I congratulate the authors and researchers involved in this study.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. While the application of an ecological perspective is to be applauded, I found Figure 1 of limited value as it is not possible, with the current Figure, to identify which of the factors relate to each ecological level within the setting. Although the text states: "The different levels of influence, i.e. personal, organizational, environmental and policy, and how they interact with the different implementation phases is presented" I cannot see that this is the case. Please redo Figure 1 so that the reader can identify which factors are relevant to each ecological level.

2. There needs to be more discussion (in the Discussion section) of how the identified factors facilitating and impeding implementation of HEPA programs in the organized sports sector reflect some of the major facilitators and barriers to intervention implementation from the key Implementation Science frameworks and models. I suggest starting with one of the following:

   • Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. Implementation Science, 2009;4:50; or
Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

1. Page 2, Line 5 and Page 5 Line 81: Please rewrite this sentence removing the word ‘only’ as interventions can be effective when not implemented properly – they just might not be as effective.

2. Page 2 Line 13: please indicate how many interviews (or how many years) for each program coordinator (assuming three years/three interviews from main text).

3. Page 2 Line 16: Please indicate that ranking was according to importance.


5. Page 8 Line 149-157: Please add information about who conducted the interview – was it the same person every time?

6. Please include some discussion in the limitations section about the limitation of using an ordinal ranking process and calculating the meaning ranking score from an ordinal ranking scale.

7. Page 12 Line 270: Please reword the sentence starting ‘Especially staff turnover’ so that it is easier to read and understand.

8. Page 13 Line 279 and 280: Please change both uses of ‘provide’ to ‘providing’ and reword the sentence to make it grammatically correct.


10. Please check the tense for all the manuscript and make sure results in particular are presented in the past tense: e.g. Page 13 Line 284: Please change ‘is difficult’ to ‘was difficult’, Page 13 Line 290: Please change ‘is having’ to ‘was having’, Page 14 Line 298: Please change ‘is facilitated’ to ‘was facilitated’, Page 14 Line 299: Please change ‘value’ to ‘valued’


12. Page 14 Line 311: please change ‘how’ to ‘that’

13. Page 14 Line 312: please replace ‘like’ to ‘for example’ and insert a semi colon in front ‘;for example,…..

14. Page 14 Line 322: please change ‘persons’ to ‘people’ and ‘that’ to ‘who’

15. Page 15 Line 336: please change ‘suited’ to ‘suitable’.

16. Page 15 Line 337: please change ‘for a club membership’ to ‘to club membership’.

17. Page 15 Line 338: please reword the sentence starting with ‘This was….’ as it is difficult to understand.

18. Page 15 Line 345: please change ‘having’ to ‘have’.


20. Page 18 Line 399: please change ‘are in support with’ to jus ‘support’ (i.e.

22. Page 18 Line 418: please delete ‘enabled to’ and change ‘reveal’ to ‘revealed’

Discretionary Revisions

1. Page 3 Line 32: the references used to support the impact of regular PA on health are all at least 5 years old. Can you provide more recent relevant references?

2. Page 4 Line 59-61: This sentence seems counter intuitive given that it was previously stated that the most improvements for HEPA can be achieved by targeting those most inactive. (page 3 line 39-39)


4. Page 5 Line 85: Consider adding a reference to and discussion about Skille’s work on clubs as policy implementers (Eivind Å. Skille International Review for the Sociology of Sport 2008; 43; 181) and competitiveness and health (Eivind Å. Skille International Review for the Sociology of Sport 2010 45: 73). These should also be considered as a significant reference for the discussion section of this paper.

5. Page 6 Line 103: consider changing ‘reasoning’ to ‘the rationale’ or ‘the purpose’.

6. Page 6 Line 124: Consider change ‘within’ to ‘over.’

7. Page 7 Line 133: Consider changing ‘and a quantitative’ to ‘followed by a quantitative’

8. Consider discussing the ethical implications of ‘requiring’ NSFs to participate in the evaluation/study as part of the funding agreement. Does this really constitute ‘consent’?

9. Page 8 Line 153: Consider adding more detailed information about the interview questions. How were they developed? Were they based on previous studies? What were the main topics?

10. Consider identifying which impeding and facilitating factors were added as a result of the meeting with coordinators and which were obtained from the interview transcriptions.

11. Page 10 Line 206: Consider changing ‘on the level’ to ‘at the level’.

12. Page 10 Line 222: Consider changing ‘a top three……..was identified’ to “the top three……were identified”.

13. Page 11 Line 225: consider changing ‘shown’ to ‘apparent’.

14. Page 12 Line 257 – 261: Was there anything in the data that suggested that successful implementation of a program within an organisation requires high level management and administrative commitment to and support for the
15. Consider providing information in the methods section about who conducted the interviews (was it the same person each time?) and who participated in each round of the interviews (was each of the NSFs represented by the same person each time?).

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests