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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The first impression reading the manuscript under consideration is that it is a paper directly forwarded to submission to "BMC Infection" after a rebuttal from another journal, as suggested by sentences like "The trial results of this acute care project will possibly demonstrate differences between the nursing home study and this other specific setting, and these will be expected by the end of 2011". Although this could be a typo it makes evident, more importantly, that it belongs to a wider study and the splitting into several articles is, in my opinion, not sufficiently justified. Indeed, as stated in the objectives: "We used the Intervention Mapping (IM) method to systematically plan, develop and evaluate our intervention program and evaluate the short and long term process."

The paper could be interesting because it aims at presenting the development of a vaccination program in an acute setting in a systematic way, which is quite new, but it is not clear in the methods nor in the description of the results. Moreover, from the perspective of IM, it is not well structured, as explained, eg, in the article (Kok, G et al "Planning for influenza vaccination in health care workers: An Intervention Mapping approach") which systematically reviews the steps involved in the application of IM to the vaccination of HCW, which could be used as a guideline. For example, the section "Result of the Process evaluation" should be placed in the appropriate steps of the IM (implementation assessment, for instance, step 5). Moreover, IM should cover three aspects which are not sufficiently clear: the use of behaviour theories (especially in Step 3 and table 2), involvement of target population and program implementers and social and environmental conditions (both transversal).

I have also a list of more concrete, but relevant issues,

- In the methods section, it is not clear what the authors actually do, which part is new and which not. They should list the source of all data and describe the methodology (what, when, where, how and why) of new research.

- It would help the reader to merge tables 3 and 4. Concerning table 4, percentages are not usually used with such a small n (n=3).

- There are also many unclear aspects. For instance, who received the pin? Two intervention centres and one or two control centres (there are two determinants linked to the pin)? This information is also relevant regarding table 4. They did
not receive the pin because it was not handed out in their center? How many people who rated the pin as appealing did receive it? This rationale can be applied to the other communication tools.

- The use of too many p's in table 4 is confusing.
- The authors should comment on the different participations rate and the possible effect on the results stated in the limitations.
- Since it is not a systematic qualitative study, the comments on the qualitative evaluation section, would be better included in the discussion.
- The conclusions are unclear, because they are not aligned with the objectives of the paper and the results presented, as expressed in sentences like "The development of clear, appealing posters and folders significantly contributes to this."
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