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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I believe that this paper has merit for publication in that it provides background on the development process of a major intervention study. However, there are issues with the writing, outlined below, that I feel prevent it from being ready for publication in its current form.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract: The methods section was not clear as to what was actually done in the study. This section should indicate who or what were the participants or subjects of the study and what was done to arrive at the results that will be presented.

2. Background: Most of the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs should be reorganized so that the information on long term care facilities is presented then the information on acute care facilities. It is somewhat confusing to go back and forth as has been done.

3. Background: the last sentence or two should state what the purpose of the study is. This was not made clear anywhere in the paper and the subsequent writing reflected this lack of focus.

4. Methods: Could be streamlined and shortened. For example in the Step one paragraph, the variables (behavioural determinants) need not be listed, rather the reader could be referred to Table 1. Also in Step four, it is not necessary to repeatedly mention the consensus process and communication expert.

5. Methods: It is not clear why the representatives of the control sites were included in the discussions of the intervention.

6. Methods, Step six: The last two sentences do not seem to belong here and should perhaps be in the discussion.

7. Results: 2nd paragraph, first 3 sentences belong in the methods section.

8. Results: Quantitative evaluation section: First paragraph up to “In the spring of 2010. . .” should be in Methods.

9. The response rates for the surveys were low. This should be mentioned in the limitations section.

10. Why were the external groups surveyed at all if they were not intervention groups?
11. Results: It seems to me that the focus of the results has been missed. It would be much more interesting to compare the two years’ responses in the intervention group because of the H1N1 pandemic, than to compare the intervention group and an external group whose purpose is not clear to me. The discussion seems to address this result, but significance testing was not done for that comparison.

12. Discussion: Last sentence, how do you know that the HCW “appreciated” posters?

13. This would be a much stronger paper with the immunization rates included.

14. Table 4: If the data from the external UMCs is to be kept in this table, then I suggest 4 columns for the data comparing 2009-10 and 2010-11 between the intervention UMCs and the same for the external UMCs.

- Minor Essential Revisions
  1. Background paragraph 1, 9th line, “pooled efficacy . . . “ please insert “of influenza vaccine.”
  2. Same place, last sentence, please clarify if the linear relationship is positive or negative.
  3. Methods, Step two paragraph, consider changing “changeability” to “which behavioural determinants could reasonably be changed through the intervention. The final decision reached by consensus . . .”
  4. Methods Step one paragraph change “if the vaccine was available . . .” to “if the vaccine were available . . .”
  5. Methods Step three paragraph last word “raise” should be “rise.”
  6. Methods Step 4 paragraph “principle investigators” should be “principal investigators.”
  7. Table 2 could be streamlined by combining in column 3 the methods that are identical across several determinants.

- Discretionary Revisions
  1. Table 3 could probably be included in text as there are few differences and few participants.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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