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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

In my view, this background section seems mixed logic with the intervention effect of RCT and evaluating reach and adoption which authors aimed. More focused description for the later aim would be favorable. To accomplish this, it would be helpful to organize previous studies about “reach and adoption” as authors described in discussion section. What is already known and what is not about the determinants of participation to health promotion in workplace and what point authors should investigate may be an interested issue in Background section. (Major Compulsory Revisions)

Why did authors choose only two dimensions in RE-AIM without full dimensions? Reader might like to know the detailed reason of this restriction. (Discretionary Revisions)

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

In the section of outcome measures of the RCT, there is information about primary and secondary outcomes in the RCT. However, in my view, this study did not use all measures (for example, sick leave). So, usual form about RCT which aimed to report the intervention effect may confuse the reader. Explaining the measures used in this study would need be more appropriate. (Major Compulsory Revisions)

In calculating sample size, it should be noted that which statistical test authors focus and expected effect size with referring appropriate prior studies and # criterion. (Discretionary Revisions)

In randomization procedure section, detailed description would be needed. How did authors randomize with using computer or web site? (Discretionary Revisions)

In the section of cognitive behavioural theory-based training, who did instruct the intervention? I think it is important information in psychosocial intervention. (Discretionary Revisions)

3. Are the data sound?

About the section of "Randomization and comparison of the intervention groups"
in the result, this type of analysis usually appears in the article of RCT which aimed to report the intervention effect. Why did authors include in this article? Or what is the difference compared with the article which reports intervention effect? (Major Compulsory Revisions)

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   In the discussion about a general goal of this intervention, authors mentioned about improving work environment factors. It seems for me that interventions in this study only include components which focus worker's stress response. Which part did these interventions focus certain work environment should be described in Method section. (Major Compulsory Revisions)

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   This is the same question I asked in the above point 1.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   In my view, this study did not deal in the intervention effect of RCT. So, this title may lead to a misunderstanding. Title should be changed to reflect only authors direct aim in this study. At the very least, the separation part, “: a randomized controlled trial” seems too strong in this study. (Major Compulsory Revisions)

   What kinds of intervention were conducted is useful information, so it would be better to include in the abstract.
   (Discretionary Revisions)

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes with comments above considered.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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