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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: The article describes the development of two interventions so it is not what is generally considered a 'study'. Overall, I found the article of interest but am not sure how applicable the learnings will be to other researchers.

The authors have done an excellent job at applying health promotion to developing sports injury prevention interventions. They have also provide a good summary of the relevant background literature on this topic.

My main issue with this article is that it does not provide enough justification for the approach used and there is not sufficient discussion about the principles underpinning the planning models used to enable the reader to understand 'why' this approach was taken.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

I think the authors need to be clear about the purpose of the article. At present the purpose of the article is stated as describing "the development of both interventions". I am not convinced that describing a process for developing an intervention is a significant contribution to the scientific literature without a more detailed description of why the approach was undertaken and how it is an improvement of previous approaches to intervention development.

Given its descriptive nature, I find it difficult to consider this article to represent 'research'. I think this article is more suited for a health promotion practice journal than a scientific SEM journal.
ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I think this paper would really benefit from a visual representation of the intervention development process that could be used as a template for readers to follow when developing interventions in the future.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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