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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript presents an effectively written piece of qualitative research that is very relevant to the current rise in mass participation events and the increase in participation of parkrun. The authors present, clearly, the aims of the research, the data (being the interviews) and the conclusions from this research. From the interviews it is clear to see the new ambassador initiative within parkrun has the feasibility to increase participation in such events for people with LTC's, but there still needs to be further input from the likes of public health and medical staff. This is a very nice manuscript and I present only minor revisions.

Comments

Line 26-27; please could the authors reconsider the word 'consistently' here as later in the manuscript authors have suggested that the parkrun may not reach certain communities or groups of LTC as effectively due to loss of sight or hearing, therefore it is not consistent.

Line 49-50; Insufficient is not quite the right terminology to use here, this does not provide adequate comparison, insufficient should be replaced with something such as lower than expected, or reduced compared to what is estimated.

Line 55-56 explain what health inequalities are, are these linked with the different communities?

Line 56; Examples of effective- Please think about re phrasing this, I am not sure 'examples' is required.

Line 72-74; Is there any evidence to support the notion that parkrun was promoted through word of mouth? If so please provide, and if not please remove this sentence. I do not feel this is the only way parkrun is promoted now given social media, facebook pages and the news of GP's prescribing physical activity and parkrun.

Line 80; Is there a reference to support the definition of 'specialist expertise' as used here or is this definition for the purpose of this manuscript? Please specify.
Line 114; please could the authors detail more how the groups were invited or found or are they already associated with outreach ambassadors.

Line 120-123 please could the authors detail how many people initially got in touch to how many people finally took part in the interview, perhaps a flow diagram of recruitment would be a clear way of displaying this information

Line 573; would it be important to consider how we would create this wider impact, would parkrun need to create a database and how this would comply with GDPR, this could be a problem parkrun and ambassadors face when trying to widen the reach of parkrun to those with LTC's.

Line 591 (and in methods line 160-161) the reflective purpose that is eluded to, could the authors provide some detail as to the types of reflective questions that the researcher used, this will provide reassurance over the potential bias.

Conclusion; Please could the authors here include that the PROVE project must still ensure it is communicated appropriately to all conditions of LTC to widen its reach, as authors have eluded to in the discussion.
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