

Letter of response

Thank you for your valuable comments and contributions in order to improve our article. We have considered each comment carefully and have revised the article, also by balancing your comments towards the other reviewers. Please see our response in the table below with details of our revisions including reference to exact line and page in the *revised* article (we have used the template). All requested revisions are highlighted in the revised article and **marked in yellow**.

Reviewer 4:	Response:
I thoroughly went through your manuscript. In the following, please find my comments:	Thank you.
<i>Title of article:</i> Your investigation relates to four Norwegian municipalities. The title suggests a more extensive study. Please, revise.	Thank you. We believe to remove “in Norway” from the title to meet your comment. We placed description of study context in the abstract, see line 13.
Introduction	
Please, add to this section the state of scientific knowledge on health-promoting dialogues in Norway (Dale/Westbye, Blix and Agotnes) and more detailed information on health-promoting dialogues as a public health offer (target groups, organisation, financing, frequency of visits).	Thank you. We have added some more knowledge from several studies, both from Norway and internationally, see lines 50-53 and lines 83-90. In addition, we have restructured some of the paragraphs in the introduction in order to improve the general flow of descriptions. Regarding the detailed information of PHV as public health offer, please see the following lines: • target groups, see lines 47-50, • organisation, see lines 47-50, • financing, see line 58, • frequency of visits, see line 59-60.
Please, provide a more precise description of your theoretical/conceptual framework.	Thank you. We have inserted a sentence elaborating on the connection between empowerment and health promotion, see lines 105-108.
Methods	
You mention that this manuscript bases on a previous master thesis. Please, insert source and moreover, indicate the originality of this article.	Thank you. We have inserted the citation, see line 144. The originality of this article is based on the need for more knowledge on the topic, see lines 144-145 and 110-112. Further, this master thesis has not been published previously via VID Specialized University’s ordinary publication sites for master’s thesis.
Provide more detailed information on the focus group interviews: Please, explain the necessity to compose three focus groups? Why is “homogeneity” of participants necessary? How long did the focus group interviews take? Who and how many persons hosted the focus groups?	Thank you. We have added the additional detailed information regarding these comments: • the necessity to compose three focus groups, see lines 139-142. • How long did the focus group interviews take? Who and how many persons hosted the focus groups? See line 142-143.
Results	
Insert source on page 4 (Kierkegaard).	Thank you. We have described the context of this participant’s reflection to help the reader (although we believe these words from Kierkegaard are well-known among healthcare professionals), see lines 227-229. A source is also inserted (41).

Discussion	
First paragraph is more appropriate for the conclusion section.	Thank you. We agree that the way we were writing the first paragraph, it could be read as a conclusion. However, we start the discussion by presenting the main findings and how they will be discussed. We have therefore chosen to rewrite the sentences in the present tense, see lines 327-329.
<i>Limitation of the study:</i> Statement (line 440 to 442) unclear.	Thank you, we agree and have revised the sentence, see line 510.
Conclusion	
Norwegian context missing; what about future research on the perspective of old(er) adults?	Thank you. We believe our findings are in line with findings in other studies, both in the Norwegian and the international context. However, publications on PHV/health-promoting dialogues have mainly investigated perspectives of the users. We therefore suggest a general need for future knowledge on how the dialogues could be reached to the users, also by providing recommendations from a Norwegian report on PHV, please see the last paragraph in the conclusions section, see lines 530-538.