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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions
1. Abstract: no need to use “However” when using “despite.” Also suggest using percentages for the qualitative results
2. Introduction: Page 6 paragraph 2 sentence beginning, “Since . . .” should be broken into two sentences for clarity.

Minor essential revisions
1. Methods: Paragraph 1 change “choose” to “chose.”
2. Results: Paragraph 1 change three or “less” to three or “fewer.”
3. Discussion: Based on the percentage of survey participants who reported exposure to the various interventions, it is a bit of an overstatement to say that they were successful.
4. Also, in the limitations, I disagree that survey respondents would have been more negative about the intervention. It is more likely that those who took the survey would have seen the posters, etc., than not to have seen them.
6. Table 4: Appeal ratings of interventions should be separate from the assessment of use. If you are making comparisons from year to year (H1N1 to regular season), which is done in the discussion, significance testing should be performed.
7. Table 2: Row 5 “it’s” should be “its.”

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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