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Reviewer's report:

Overall, I had no significant concerns with the structure of, or arguments made within, the paper. There were however a significant number of typographical and grammatical issues, which make up most of the following comments.

With respect to line and page numbers, these comments are referring to the page numbers printed on the manuscript (not the page number according to the PDF), and the line numbers that appear to belong to the original manuscript (i.e.: the ones that actually line up with the text).

Page 4, line 47: "In England..." should be followed by a comma: "In England, ...".

Page 4, line 49: "which" should be preceded by a comma, i.e.: "...health, which...", when used in this context.

Page 4, line 51: Would suggest expanding briefly upon "psychological problems", which is fairly vague and broadly reaching. Even just listing key examples (e.g.: Social Anxiety Disorder secondary to stigmatization and bullying).

Page 4, line 52: "Once established" is superfluous; this sentence could just as well start with "Obesity is difficult to reverse,".

Page 4, line 63: Unnecessary comma in "...reviews[13-16], ...". Also, this sentence reads as though there should be a "that" before "effective", as in: "Several systemic reviews have identified interventions...that are effective...".

Page 4, line 64: Typo: "Idenfitying" - "Identifying". Also, in that sentence, suggest exchanging "which" for "that" and removing the comma after "education,"

Page 4, line 66: Need for a second comma after "outcomes", if the phrase ", which tended to focus more on diet and health knowledge outcomes" is being used define "Educational based interventions".

Page 4, line 68: It looks like there's a different font being used for the A in "Another". Also for this sentence, commas would suffice instead of semi-colons as none of the list items themselves contain commas.

Page 5, line 76: Sentence starting with "One of the key...". This sentence lists two components, head teachers' perspectives and the intervention being a priority. Unless the key component is the head teachers' perspective on both the importance of healthy eating and of
making the intervention a priority, in which case something like "...healthy eating and making it a priority across the school". Otherwise, suggest starting the sentence with "Key components to a successful intervention are the schools'....".

Page 5, line 80: Suggest being consistent with use of "school-based" or "school based", here and throughout the document.

Page 5, line 81: Typo: "thier" - "their"

Page 5, line 83: Sentence starting with "Additionally information is...", should have a comma: "Additionally, information is...".

Page 5, line 86: Comma after "...UK, ..." is not necessary. "to promote" directly connects to "PhunkyFoods intervention".

Page 5, line 93: Two spaces between "England was".

Page 6, line 121: Point 1 ends in a comma, Point 6 ends in a semi-colon, whereas the other points end in a period - unclear why the two variations.

Page 7, line 132: Semi-colons are not necessary here, commas are more appropriate as none of the individual items in the list themselves contain commas.

Page 7, line 135: PPI is not spelled out prior to its use here, nor does it get used anywhere else in the document that I could find; it should not be an abbreviation in this case or at a minimum listed in the List of Abbreviations.

Page 7, line 138: "behaviour change;" should have a colon after it, not a semi-colon.

Page 9, line 192: A comma is needed between: "Questionnaire[21], which".

Page 10, line 198: "Synchronised Nutrition and Activity Program" is bounded on the left by a double-quote and the right by a single-quote.

Page 10, line 202: Suggest splitting this sentence and moving the semi-colon for readability. "...at baseline and 18 months. For the Year 2 pupils, SNAP was only used...of 7 years; as a consequence, only...".

Page 10, line 203: The SNAP assessment not being used for Year 2 pupils at baseline seems like a significant limitation; this data cannot be compared to a baseline, even with the understanding that the program has not been validate children under 7. Suggest noting this limitation in the Strengths & Limitations section and the end and how it can be addressed going forward.

Page 11, line 240: ICC is used twice in the document without being spelled out or otherwise listed in the List of Abbreviations.

Page 11, line 246: A comma is needed before "which".
Page 12, line 256: Most of this paragraph is information that is already explained, and belongs, in the Methods section. Only that all schools were retained and the fluctuation and pupil dropout rate is applicable to the Results section.

Page 12, line 258: "Figure 1" is given in relation to the study area, but Figure 1 is the logic model diagram.

Page 14, line 272: Low SES is often associated with poorer understanding of healthy eating and lifestyle choices. A greater percentage of low SES students (using FSM as a proxy measurement) in the Control arm inversely implies a greater percentage of higher SES students in the Intervention arm. Taking this a step further, that perhaps predisposes the Intervention arm to a larger magnitude positive effect when comparing the 18-month outcome measures. It's been clearly stated that the study is not powered to measure the effect sizes, but this should still be considered for later mention as a limitation of the study or otherwise potentially affecting the trends that are commented on in the Results section.

Page 14, line 282: "Overall" is superfluous and can be removed, instead starting the sentence with "Of the...".

Page 15, Table 2: The subcategory "Health Weight" is, presumably, supposed to be labeled "Healthy Weight". Also, per the above point (pg 14, ln 272), the control arm has more students who were overweight/obese and fewer at a healthy weight at the start of the intervention, a finding that is also correlated with lower SES.

Page 17, line 322: Comma needed between "year, although limited".

Page 17, line 328: The period after "duplication." is probably supposed to be a comma.

Page 17, line 330: "PF" is used here and later a couple of times as an abbreviation, but it's not clear that PhunkyFoods would be more appropriate if spelled out vs PhunkyFoods Programme, which is used by the acronym PFP far more consistently. Suggest sticking with PFP across the board.

Page 18, line 344: "photographs;" is followed by a semi-colon; a comma would be more appropriate in this list.

Page 19, line 363: There is already a Figure 2 earlier in the document (Trial Consort Diagram, pg 13).

Page 19, line 366: Inconsistency throughout this paragraph in capitalization of "Year" as it precedes "Year 2" or "Year 4".

Page 19, line 375: A space is needed between "difference-2.3"

Page 20, line 386: Again, suggest mentioning here that baseline data was only available for the Year 4 pupils.

Page 22, line 421: There is already a Table 4 earlier in the document (pg 21).
Page 23, line 428: Inconsistency in abbreviation of "Control"; spelled "Con" under Year 4, Baseline.

Page 23, line 434: "MRC" is not previously spelled out, nor listed in the List of Abbreviations.

Page 24, line 459: The rationale for increase by half a portion is not given; it might help to elaborate on why half a portion would be the target vs a full portion or more?

Page 25, line 486: For the sentence starting with "However there were...", suggest adding a semi-colon after "old computers; " and a period before consequently, i.e.: "...data being inputted). Consequently, the results...".

Page 26, line 506: This paragraph comes across as one of the weakest of the paper. Positive effects of the PFP are cited throughout the paper as trends; indicative of an intervention effect but not definitive because of the sample size. Yet here, a trend showing a (perhaps paradoxical) negative effect of the intervention is dismissed because "the sample size is too small". It suggests a double-standard for looking at the trends in the results. It could just as easily be said of any of the positive effects that the sample size is too small for the trends to be indicative of intervention effect and thereby the PFP is not likely to be effective on a larger scale.

I'm not sure how best to suggest reframing this point. There do appear to be a lot of positives to this programme indicating it would be good to see it trialed on a large scale, so perhaps elaborate that this trend was noted, it matches NCMP data for the years involved, and that it will have to be closely monitored in a Phase 3 trial.

Also, the grammatical structure is such that what is not indicative is the sample itself, not the trend towards obesity; suggest at least adding "...too small for this to be indicative...".

Page 26, line 513: The structure of this sentence reads awkwardly. Suggest removing "recalled participating in PFP".

Page 26, line 515: On this line teacher training is suggested for May/June, on pg 24, ln 450, it is suggested for May-July.

Page 27, line 545: Suggest splitting the sentence that starts with "School based...", with a period at: "...fixed intervention. Teachers are able to...".

Page 28, line 556: For the sentence starting with "A recent systematic...", commas would be sufficient as none of the list items themselves include commas.

Page 29, line 593: Unnecessary comma after "findings".
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