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Reviewer's report:

This paper reports on an intervention that aims to promote healthy nutrition and physical activity in schools. The paper is well written and addresses an important health problem in an ethnically diverse area. However, the objectives of the program are not well described and this needs to be addressed. Similarly, there is insufficient detail of the content of each of the program's components as well as a justification for each component. It is also not clear how the program components were delivered - for example on page 6 the PFP is referred to as an online behaviour change intervention, but it is clear further on in the paper that many components are not online.

Page 7: the term PPI needs to be spelled out. The authors state that the program is supported by "high profile academics" but it is not clear how the expertise (rather than the profile) is incorporated into the program. Finally, the authors state that the program has been mapped against the BCW - but was it developed with a theoretical framework?

Page 9: was the HLKQ pilot tested for reliability and validity?

Page 16 refers to one school having an afterhours Phunky Club; what was the nature of the club? How was the fidelity of the intervention maintained if teachers chose the components they would deliver? How did they determine what would be most engaging? Could they have chosen topics they were more comfortable delivering? Line 313 the suggestion that children at intervention schools were more open to trying new foods needs to have some actual data attached - at present it seems like an anecdote and as such is not suitable for an academic paper.

Page 18: more rigor is required in the analysis and reporting of results

Page 20 what do the findings regarding food and activity preferences mean in practice? How were they measured?
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