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Reviewer's report:

Overall, the use of the evaluation model for public health interventions was a positive approach to accomplish the aims of the paper. The methods and results were confusing, as important information was missing or not well described. The discussion section was well-done and provided good insights into the findings. The manuscript had numerous grammatical errors and needs to be proofread carefully. Word choice needs to be considered throughout to correct terminology.

Abstract - needs clarification

Lines 34-35: Need to clarify the type of data collected from the variety of participants, for example, did the families complete surveys and questionnaires and the facilitator completed field notes and activity reports? What data collection methods were used to collect qualitative data and how many total individuals participated? Does family mean parent and child together or something else? How old were the children involved? Who was the facilitator in terms of background or training?

Line 40: For results, need more information about what the 71% refers to

Lines 46-47: For conclusions, suggesting web-based video as a promising avenue was not based on results reported in the abstract. Table 5 indicates online videos were preferred, but this was not included in the abstract results section.

Introduction - supports the aims, good description of rationale

Methods - appropriate but the description is confusing in certain areas

Line 93 - how were workshops validated? Typically evaluation instruments are validated rather than instruction. Could use other terminology.

Lines 106-107 - does the term families include at least a parent and child, or could parents or children attend separately?

Lines 109-111 - Need to better describe what is meant by field notes. Here it seems that parents completed the field notes, while in Table 1, it seems that facilitators completed the field notes.
Table 1 - suggest adding another column to identify who was responsible for completing each tool, also missing the observation checklist in this table.

Lines 130-131: Reference 24 refers to Contento's 2002 review of nutrition education evaluation, but doesn't provide information about how the participant questionnaire was tested for any type of validity or reliability.

Line 162 - need to explain what the total of 45 workshops were based on in terms of schedule or time period, for example, one per week for 10 months?

Line 169 - how were 26/31 families enrolled when there were only 17 participants, what does it mean to be enrolled?

Tables 4 and 5 - how could 26 respond regarding appreciation if only 17 attended workshops?

Lines 271 and 388 - what does "animation" mean in this context? Consider another word choice.

Lines 290-291 - how did the participants know what knowledge was related to each key message?

Discussion - this section was well-done with insightful comments based on the findings.

Line 312 - exposure rather than exposition

Word choice throughout - participants attend workshops rather than "assist to a workshop"

Line 114 - collect vs collection

Table 1 - divulgation vs delivery

Line 125 - compatibilized - not sure what this means

Line 152 - codification vs coding

Lines 218-219 - non-divulged vs description of the key messages that were not delivered

Line 249 - lack of time is a factor, not a characteristic

Lines 413-423 - need to consider the small sample size as a limitation

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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.
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**Quality of written English**
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