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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

thank you very much for this interesting paper that describes a toolkit that aligns local district characteristics with available data and interventions.

I have only a few comments:

Methods, section 2.1b, page 10, row 107: You have performed a working session per district type. However, eight sessions versus nine district types means that one is missing. Please explain which district type was not represented and why?

Results, section 3.3, page 14: I would appreciate a bit more information if there is a specific approach that supports the initiators in contacting and involving stakeholders from other sectors.

This is linked to two rather general question: Who is mainly using the toolkit or is starting the initiative? Are these public health authorities (on regional (or local) level)? On page 16 Dutch municipalities are described as users, can it be specified what kind of actors take the initiative?

The interventions described in Table 2 have mostly a strong health focus. Please explain if it is planned that the interventions are extended by interventions from other resorts, e.g. social affairs, transport, work,...?
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