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"REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? No

Reviewer comments: The authors have done a good job explaining what they did to develop the two interventions. The main question I have is - why should readers be interested in this description?

I don't think the authors have provided a general or strong enough overview of the process that they used or the rationale for each step in the process. Therefore, the whole paper comes across as a descriptive case study of what was done, rather than a useful model or template, supported by a case study, that others can follow to develop interventions. I think this stems from the fact that the authors set out to describe "the development of two interventions to change injury preventive behaviour, to give insight in the execution of the development of an intervention, e.g. in the required steps, the different research methods used and, the lengthy and time consuming development process." I would like to know much more about what the authors learnt from the process.

In the background section (Pg 4, Line 55), the authors state that "In sport injury-prevention research, interventions have often been developed following structured and systematic processes often applied in health promotion research." I don't think this is accurate, and there are no references to support this statement. In fact, I think that the real strength of this article is that it is one of a very few that outlines how a health promotion intervention development process has been applied in the sports injury prevention field. The problem, from my perspective, is too much of the article is spent describing the specifics of what was found as a result of applying the process, rather that clearly describing the process, how it was applied, what was learnt and why others should also use it. As articulated by Reviewer 1 "tell the story of the rigorous process of intervention development. That seems to be a key aspect of this study - the process.""
In my original review I suggested that the 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. In response to this the authors provided visual representations of the IM and KTS models/frameworks without locating what they had done within each of these diagrams. To me, this should be the starting point for this type of article - with the text then providing the case study detail of what was done and what was learnt."

**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**
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