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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewer,

Please see our point by point response to your comments.

Due to the holidays, I will be out of the office from August 78th til September 2nd.

Kind regards,

Ellen Kemler

Editor Comments:

Please copyedit your manuscript to improve the standard of written English. We suggest that you ask a native English-speaking colleague to help you with this.

Author’s reply: First of all, thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript again. The first version of our manuscript has been corrected by a native speaker. We have asked him again to edit our manuscript.

BMC Sports Science, Medicine and Rehabilitation operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the
online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (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?

N/A - no methodology

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

N/A - no experiments or analyses

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?

N/A - no results to interpret

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: I did not receive a point-by-point responses to my previous comments so it is difficult (and frustrating) to get a handle on how they have responded. The revised manuscript does a much better job of outlining a standard intervention development process that other researchers can follow.

Author’s reply: We are sorry to hear that the reviewer did miss a point-by-point response to his comments last time. The adjustments we made in revision round two were so extensive, we basically re-wrote the whole article. I thought that we had explained the major changes we did make in a response to the reviewers. However, when I lookup the last submission, all I saw was a small note about the document with track changes. I sincerely apologize for the lack of a more detailed response to the reviewers comments.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The manuscript was difficult to read and follow because of the language used. I highly recommend that the authors get an experienced editor and proof reader to work on the manuscript with them.

Author’s reply: We have asked a Dutch-English translator | Editor (papers for publication) | Proofreader to edit our manuscript.

I also suggest that the authors take a look at the following two references to see if they can be used to inform the manuscript:

Author’s reply: Thank you for the suggested references. We have used the first reference in our manuscript (introduction and discussion section) “With use of KTS and IM, we designed our own developmental process. Donaldson et al (2016) published a systematic, but pragmatic and iterative intervention development process as well [16]. Their 6-step intervention development process involves (1) compiling research evidence, clinical experience, and knowledge of the implementation context; (2) consulting with experts; (3) engaging with end users; (4) testing the intervention; (5) using theory; and (6) obtaining feedback from early implementers. All of these steps are integrated in our three-step process as well. Both described processes underline the idea that research evidence alone is not enough to develop implementable interventions or to change behavior, and evidence-based practice integrates the best available scientific evidence with practitioner and end user values. The development of an intervention in co-creation with experts and end users clarifies the need for tailor-made interventions. A “one-size fits all”- intervention will not fulfil the needs of different groups of end-users. Hence it is necessary to focus on specific target groups to enhance the usability of an intervention.”

The second reference was familiar. At this moment, we are developing an implementation plan for the Runfitcheck, according to step 5 of intervention mapping. As the current manuscripts focusses on the development of the intervention, we did not use this reference in our manuscript.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

See comment above re engaging an experienced proof reader and editor to assist with revising the manuscript to make it easier to read and follow.

Author’s reply: We have asked a Dutch-English translator | Editor (papers for publication) | Proofreader to edit and improve our manuscript.

I would also like to see a diagrammatic representation about how the 4 step process depicted in Fig 1 is informed by the IM and KTS frameworks (note - these are not theories as suggested by the authors).

Author’s reply: IM and KTS are indeed no theories. As outlined in the introduction they are developmental protocols. We have changed “theoretical background” into “developmental protocols” in the introduction of the abstract and the introduction itself.

We have adjusted the model of our developmental process to show where our steps were informed by KTS and IM.