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Reviewer's report:

General Comments:
1. The question is clearly delineated and methods adequately described.
2. The context is adequately explained.
3. The limitations are considered and well covered.
4. Usual conventions are adhered to.
5. The abstract provides an adequate summary of the findings.

Discretionary Revisions:
1. Introduction: it might have been helpful to provide references to some of the literature regarding health education interventions in waiting rooms - the later references in the discussion focus on AV interventions.
2. Discussion: I would have been interested to know what the other messages on the broadcast were.
3. Table 1: This table is poor. It gives no information about the demographics of the groups, whether they were similar in age-range or not, the number of adults versus children. This is relevant given that only adults were targetted for vaccination.
4. Discussion - I would have expected some discussion of the potential for resource generation for the GP with this type of intervention (it was alluded to in terms of whether the AV devices were cost effective). There are some ethical implications for GPs in terms of the conflict between choosing which type of health messages to promote versus the potential income that might be generated. The health needs of the individual community should be foremost. There is also potential for pharmaceutical sponsorship of these devices, which again has ethical implications regarding the choice of health messages broadcast.
5. The title is quite broad given the findings of the study. It could be amended to reflect the actual impact of the intervention in this case.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Methods, 1st paragraph, last sentence: delete "d" from "equipped with an"d" audio..", add "who" between "patients...visited GPs"
2. Table 4. Please add a legend.
3. Discussion, 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence: reference should be (7), not 6.
4. Discussion, 3rd paragraph, 5th sentence: remove " before Some authors..., and "it" between ", that ..... was most effective".
5. References: 1. WONCA - the hyperlink doesn't work - has it reprinted accurately?
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