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Reviewer’s report:

This was a very interesting and relevant paper. I enjoyed reading it. I do have some remarks on the manuscript that I believe will make it more understandable and complete.

General:

- Align your in-text citations, as you've now used different ways to cite papers.
- A more elaborate description of some of your sections will increase the understandability of your manuscript, for example the introduction, method and strengths & limitations.
- I would recommend to add the flowchart of the recruitment/inclusion as a figure to your manuscript.

Introduction:

- Line 50: use 'that' instead of which? Further, home environment interventions may also target more physical environmental factors, maybe you should not be so explicit in this statement?
- Line 56: Do you have a reference for this statement?
- Line 59: What do you mean with 'while encouraging’?

I would suggest to add already some description of your intervention in the introduction, why was it developed and implemented? And why did you hypothesize the possible effects on parent outcomes? It remains to me a bit unclear whether you've designed your study to include parental measures. This could be added maybe in the introduction or in the method sections.

Methods:

- Line 71: were there any a priori inclusion or exclusion criteria?
- line 76: please specify which supplementary material you are referring to.

- line 78: Was the study coordinator involved in recruitment or data collection? Could randomization be influence? And if so, also account that in your strengths&limitations. Please elaborate some more on your randomization method.

- line 81: What were behavioural supports? Could you elaborate somewhat more on that?

- line 90: add were measurements took place, the abbreviations 6M and 8M occur already earlier in the paper, so place the full description of the abbreviations at the right place.

- line 106: body composition measureS?

Results:

Table 1: Did you test the differences between the groups? In particular, in the >25 kg/m² stratum, the differences between groups seem quite substantial. So, can you provide some information to support your statement in line 111 (no substantive differences)?

- It may be valuable to also report change scores within the groups for your different outcomes, for future use of your study in systematic reviews/meta-analysis. Did you consider reporting effect sizes to give an indication of the magnitude of the effect? Do you have some information on the power of your analyses?

Discussion:

- line 160-162: How do you conclude this from your study? This was only focused on body composition outcomes in parents? Maybe this sentence needs some revising.

- line 164: should this be 'solely targeting children', as your program was a child-focused program?

- line 165-174: Do you have some process data to explain the differences between the 2HV and 4HV groups? For example, were all visits carried out in all families? Were there any other interventions in the groups? Were there differences in how the home visits were appreciated?

- line 173-174: Do you mean further research or additional intervention activities?

- line 182: You talk about formative research, can you explain more what you will be doing with these results? To what project/research was this formative?

Conclusion:
- line 191: This conclusion is not in line with your results, is one year the 18-month follow-up? And you write in your results that not all effects were sustained.

- line 195: Does this belong here or is it more fitted somewhere in your methods section?
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