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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. The results section of the abstract is completely uninformative and needs to be completely redrafted so that the reader actually understands a. how many centres took part, b. what the conclusions of the IM were and c. what the results were.

2. Results, first paragraph - this section is very muddled in places and it is difficult to determine exactly what you are trying to say. In particular I am unclear about the behavioural determinants you report and whether the "use" is self-reported, observed, or what. I think this probably needs much more clarity in the methods too, so it can be logically followed from one section to the other.

3. This is an introductory paper for a trial that you hope to publish later - this needs to be acknowledged in the introduction of the paper and in the abstract.

**Results, quantitative evaluation -** I note very low response rate to questionnaire - this needs more discussion later.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. There is a reference to "exposing HCWs to all elements" in both the abstract and the final paragraphs of the main text. This is not mentioned at all elsewhere, and if this is an outcome, it needs to be described as such. If it is just that this would be a "best case scenario" this also needs to be described and referenced.

2. References are required in the second paragraph of the introduction at the end of the first and third sentences.

4. Throughout the paper the authors flip between present and past tense. This should be corrected throughout.

5. Results, second paragraph - first sentence should be in the methods section.

6. Results, second paragraph - "Especially the mobile carts were considered a huge improvement" This is not a sentence, and is also not actually mentioned anywhere else, so although I am sure you are right that the mobile carts have made an impression, this half-sentence stands alone to show it.

7. Discussion, first sentence - Suggest replacing with "In this paper we demonstrate how the Intervention Mapping method developed by Bartholomew et al [ref] can be used to develop an immunization intervention programme to improve influenza vaccination uptake in HCWs".
8. Discussion, first paragraph. If you plan to state that pandemic influenza influenced behaviour you need to emphasise it more in the results, perhaps including it within the tables presented. Otherwise, lose this sentence and limit your comments on the pandemic to the later paragraph.

3. There are numerous grammatical and idiomatic errors in the paper, including but not limited to:

a. Last paragraph of Step two in methods - "can be developed as specific as possible" should be either "can be developed to be as specific as possible" or "can be developed as specifically as possible"

b. Same paragraph - "HCWs who unawarely choose not to get vaccinated" - "unawarely is not a word in English. I suggest you replace it throughout with "unintentionally"

c. Step five, first sentence - "should be a clearly organized in order to achieve" - apart from the typo this also doesn't make much sense. "should be clearly arranged" might be a better choice?

d. Step five, second paragraph - "If there existed one" replace with "if one existed"

e. Results, second paragraph - "considered as very useful" should read "considered very useful".

f. Results, second paragraph, and elsewhere - "informational" is not a word. "Information" would do. Or "Plenary meetings providing information".

g. Table 1. replace column label "Importance" with "odds ratio"

h. Table 1. "changeable" - suggest you mention how this was defined again here (as tables and figures should be self explanatory)

Discretionary revisions

1. Generally the paper feels a bit long and in particular seems to repeat the references to the communications expert - I would suggest trimming them.

2. I am slightly troubled by your insistence that posters being "appreciated" by HCWs was equivalent to them being effective in changing behaviour. I don't see any proof of this in your text or tables, and it is not referenced as being shown elsewhere. I would argue that it is in fact not the case, and that "appreciated" was equivalent to "noticed".

3. References to "folder" - could explain where/what etc.
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