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Reviewer's report:

Are audiovisual messages in the waiting room useful for health education?
Eubelen C, Brendel F, Franckh F, Beleche J, Freyens A, Giet D.

This paper explores the effectiveness of audiovisual messages in GP waiting rooms for uptake of tetanus booster vaccination.

The following are my main comments:

1. The research question is well defined. However details of study design are not made explicit. The authors refer to an intervention and control group indicating they employed an experimental study design eg. Randomised Controlled Trial.

2. The methodology presented lacks detail. There is no reference to a sample size calculation. Inclusion and exclusion criteria is not stated. Group allocation is defined as “the intervention group comprised of the patients in consulting the GP’s that used the two audiovisual equipped waiting rooms”. Randomisation is not discussed.

3. The results section presents data on adult tetanus prescriptions from the six study GPs that were filled by local pharmacists. Denominator data relating to the number of people who were due a booster tetanus vaccination and the number people who were given a prescription by the GPs are not presented. Therefore it is difficult for the reader to interpret the results.

4. As the study design is unclear I was unable to discern if the appropriate statistical analyses were conducted. For this reason I would recommend a statistician review the analyses.

5. Denominator data are not presented in Table 2. Symbols in Table 4 should be defined in a footnote.

6. In the Discussion the authors conclude “Our results showed that when used alone, an audiovisual message in the waiting room was effective”. In view of my concerns regarding the methodology and analyses I do not think such a conclusion can be drawn from this study.

7. The authors present the weaknesses of the study well.

8. The authors do not report that ethical approval was sought or obtained for the study.

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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