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Reviewer's report:

I enjoyed this paper, and found it easy to read while providing interesting information. I think the focus is more on the PROVE program versus the overall parkrun program, and suggest the title, abstract, and introduction be edited to reflect this. Specific comments are below, and thank you for the opportunity to read this manuscript.

Abstract:

1. Suggest adding description before self-management

2. For the second sentence, suggest capitalizing parkrun, even in not usually done as it is the start of the sentence (or revise sentence). Also, suggest adding some information/descriptor about "long-term health conditions" and the location of parkrun (e.g., city, country).

3. Suggest describing PROVE project (after reading the paper, this is essential).

4. The Outreach Ambassadors have long-term health conditions? I would suggest adding this information.

5. I now see the location of the parkrun. I recommend moving London earlier in the sentence or earlier in the abstract

6. The second sentence in the methods is not quite clear to me. Who are the critical friends? Additional detail would be useful if space limits allow.

7. Given that the results and conclusion focus on the PROVE project, the authors really should consider adding information about this project.
Introduction

1. The introduction paragraph, I think, would benefit from a larger discussion regarding self-management vs. as the paragraph seems to be equating self-management to physical activity, one component of self-management.

2. An expanded discussion of barriers to active lifestyles would be useful, I think.

3. The parkrun description is very nice.

4. Suggest adding the percent of adults in UK have a disability where you provide this information about parkrun attendees.

5. The only underrepresented group that is the focus of the PROVE project is people with LTCs? Based on the first sentence, I had assumed, the focus would be on a number of underrepresented groups.

6. Line 77: only the p of parkrun needs to be in bold font.

7. Line 87: the interventions are implemented as part of parkrun

8. Information about how the Outreach Ambassadors are identified and what training they receive would be useful.

9. Line 96: Maybe add research to "This found".

10. Line 100: the insights for people with LTC was specific to people with mental health difficulties? And these insights are what was discussed in the prior sentence?

Methods

1. I had expected the conditions to be health-related, and would not have included learning disabilities, but I could be wrong about this.

2. Suggest adding the percent after you provide the sample size.

3. Suggest adding references for thematic analysis and expanding the description of thematic analysis.

4. Lines 152-153, this should be expanded as it is a novel approach, and the description is not quite clear (at least to me).

5. Were data coded by one or multiple researchers?

6. How was Reflexivity explored, examined?
7. How were potential bias addressed (page 160)?

Findings

1. Were differences by interviewer categories examined? Also, information regarding the number of people invited to participate by category in the recruitment text would be useful.

2. Is there information available regarding length of time being an Ambassador?

3. The authors could consider adding sample quotes to Table 1.

4. Sub-theme 1b: needs additional detail for clarity. It seems like, at least two me, that there are 2 things: 1) maybe limited/no support, 2) lack of structured support. Also, it may be useful to clearly state that this is support at parkrun (I think) and not regarding efforts to get people to parkrun.

5. Did the PROVE project (line 217) explore needs of people with LTC who did/did not attend parkrun? This is not quite clear to me. I do not think that the Ambassadors did this, but perhaps they do this informally?

6. Line 226: Seems like a different theme to me.

7. Suggest dividing subtheme 1c into two. I also would suggest a reordering of themes. For example, subtheme 3b seems like it should be presented before the them about PROVE project sustainability.

Discussion:

1. This sentence, to me, is overstating findings: "It also demonstrates the specific benefits that parkrun has for people living with LTCs." It identified perceived benefits.

2. Line 531: "self-managed physical activity." In the introduction, the authors talked about self-management of LTC, but the only management issued explored in physical activity. Therefore, suggest revising introduction.

3. Line 539: the authors may want to expand discussion of social capital

4. The discussion section is at times redundant with results. A more depth discussion of explanation of findings would be useful or as to how findings agree/disagree with other work.
5. Study limitations include a small sample that did not allow for differences by respondent category to be investigated (e.g., person with TLC, carer), as is having one person code the data, although the use of critical friends is interesting.
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