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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has been improved and covers a really interesting domain for public health. However, there are still many parts especially in the section of the results that have to be clarified.

1. The authors should describe the ‘social cognition approach’ in order to be easier for the reader to understand the rationale of the model.

2. Since the fit of the model was of borderline adequacy (2/4 indices were adequate and the remaining 2 indices were not satisfactory) I would recommend to calculate and provide the values of some more fit indices (such as, AIC, CAIC, NNFI, ECVI). If the values of these indices (e.g. 4/6 indices) are adequate then the model will not be of borderline adequacy.

3. Have you tested two different models? It seems that you present fit indices values for two different models (the first is of borderline adequacy and the second one is adequate) but at the end of the paragraph you write that the same model is applicable for both groups. This is not clear. I am wondering if you have to test two different models since you have two different types of invitations and then compare their indices, calculate the x2 difference between the two models and conclude which is the best.

4. There is no indication in the model regarding the direct impact of invitation upon attitude. Please find a way to clarify this. Also there is no indication in the model regarding the indirect effect of the invitation on intention, mediated by knowledge, (indirect #=-.06 (90%CI: -.10 to -.02), p=.017).

5. Line 11 in second para of 12 page should write ‘43% of the variance in intention was mainly explained by attitudes…’

I hope to find my comments helpful.

I would like to note that the Editor may want to ask for a more statistically qualified assessment of the results section of the manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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