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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate the effort of the authors in answering some of my queries. I understand well their point about splitting the trial and the program design and implementation in two papers. Although I agree with their decision, it seems to me that they are not yet being comprehensive in the description of the process, neither using the tool properly.

IM is a systematic method to describe an intervention. For instance, in my opinion, "Results of process evaluation" have not been placed in the appropriate step of the IM method, as I suggested in my first revision. Also step 3, one of the basis of the IM tool, is still unclear, more centered in practical strategies than in behavioral theories that support strategies. The use of qualitative in table 3 is not accurate. Qualitative research explores phenomena in-depth, investigates the why and how and not only the what (or how much, as in this case). The use of % in such a small n is neither appropriate.

I am afraid I have to recommend a resubmission of the paper. Although the topic is quite new and the systematic description of this kind of interventions may be helpful to the people who work in the field of vaccination promotion of health care workers, I do not think that the paper is suitable for publication in BMC Infection in its present form.
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