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Reviewer's report:

Abstract:

• MAJOR: Background Section: The first sentence of the background sentence should include an adjective for the type of “evaluation” you are conducting in your study. For example, after re-reading the manuscript it became apparent the second time after reviewing the abstract that you would be conducting a “process evaluation”.

• MAJOR: Background Section: The following comment while pertinent to this sentence of the abstract is also true for the entire manuscript – The abbreviation Workers’ health surveillance should likely be Workers’ health surveillance programme (WHSP); many future sentence structures read awkward without the “programme” at the end of it.

• MINOR: Methods Section: In the first sentence consider adding the word “construction” before the word sites. It might not be clear to your reader that you are indeed referring to construction sites.

• MINOR: Methods Section: Consider using another word for “dose” in the abstract. This word is very confusing even if part of the intervention evaluation process – it sounds like a drug is being delivered. Either considering removing the sentence “The process evaluation included the following: reach, dose received, fidelity and dose delivered” altogether or modify it so that it does not include the words ‘dose’ by itself (i.e., ‘intervention dose received’, ‘intervention dose delivered’).

• MAJOR: Methods or Results section: consider adding the time period or length of time in which the intervention took place.

Introduction Section:

• MAJOR: For this entire section of the paper, again consider writing out “workers’ health surveillance programme (WHSP)” – you will notice that throughout the manuscript you leave the sentence with ‘WHS’ when it really a programme. For example, review the second sentence of the second paragraph ‘First, a WHS allows an evaluation of the effectiveness of control measures in the workplace…’; this really should be “First, a WHS PROGRAMME (or WHSP) allows an evaluation…”

• MINOR: In the sentence that begins with “To contribute to the improvement of the quality of the occupational health care”; please remove the word ‘the’.
• MINOR: In the second to last paragraph, first sentence, I think the word choice is “process evaluation” instead of “effect evaluation”

• MINOR: The wording in this sentence is awkward “This approach has been used in to provide a detailed insight”

Methods Section:
• MAJOR: Study population section: Why is the team to conduct the intervention so large (i.e., OP and one or two physician assistants)? Is the physician assistant alone insufficient to carry out the intervention protocol? For clarity also, is a physician assistant in the Netherlands the same as a physician assistant (in terms of training) as in the U.S., or is the physician assistant from the Netherlands a medical assistant?

• MINOR: Procedure: Why was the OHS staff used to recruit workers into the study? Why were workers not recruited by research staff at the construction site or via the phone?

• MINOR: Intervention Section: It is not clear what are “signaling questions”. What are the authors trying to say?

• MINOR: Intervention Section: What assurance do the authors have that the OP’s conducted the structured invention protocol to the workers with fidelity – especially since there are different Ops rendering interventions at different sites? For example, the advise provided by the OP could vary considerably – hence influencing some of your outcome measures that are being used as part of your Process evaluation.

• MINOR: Measures and data collection procedures section: the last bullet that refers to semi-structured interviews if the occupational health professionals – does this include the Ops, the physicians’s assistants, and the ergonomists?

• MINOR: Dose delivered and fidelity section: What does “correctly processed” mean? Does that mean a certain percentage of results were correct?

Results Section:
• MINOR: Dose Delivered: Second sentence – check wording – “OP planned intended”

• MINOR: Would it be best to remove the OP that did not receive the half-day training given it will affect the “fidelity” scores hence the overall process evaluation??

Discussion / Conclusion Section:
• MINOR: Could the authors expand their discussion section to include areas for improvement in the process evaluation? What factors/variables were good to include in your evaluation that might be different than that offered in the Linnan and Steckler paper.

Tables:
• MINOR: For the Table 1 and Table 2 titles – could they be a bit more
descriptive to include the description of the construction study – a bit more standalone.
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