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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.

I welcome the authors’ revisions of the original manuscript which addressed most of the issues I raised in my previous review on 2nd December 2010.

Review of the revised version of manuscript

My main comments are as follows:
1. Although the authors give more details of the methodology the study design remains ambiguous to the reader.
2. Sample size is not discussed in either the original or revised manuscript
3. Why was ethical approval obtained in a different country to where the study was conducted? Was local ethical approval required or obtained?
4. I think another table of results is necessary to present the information from the bivariate analyses. The information presented in Table 1 is confusing- it is difficult to discern what analyses ‘(a)’, ‘(b)’, ‘(c)’ relate to or mean.
5. In the discussion the authors state “Presumably, the audiovisual message broadcast in the waiting rooms attracted the patient’s attention and encouraged them to take the active step of asking for the vaccination, leading to an increase in the immunization coverage of the target population”. I don’t think this can be presumed from the study.
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