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Dear Editor,

Thank you for accepting our manuscript (MS: 5937074699646176). We believe that the reviewers comments have contributed greatly to quality of the manuscript. We added the required information to the manuscript, we hope that our revision is satisfactory to you and the reviewers and that this manuscript will be published. Changes to the manuscript are highlighted in yellow.

We agree with issuing a press release about our article.

Yours truly,

Luuk Engbers

COMMENTS ON REVIEWERS REPORT

Comment Referee:

-The response regarding the need of a mixed model (multilevel analysis) should be looked at by an statistician. The authors content that a multilevel analysis is not needed because there were only two worksites but I still think there might unmeasured characteristics within a worksite that may have an effect in the interventions results. I request that this issue be solved by an statistician. At the least the response to the authors should be added to the manuscript under the Discussion sessions.

-The response regarding the randomization scheme referred to the randomization of the employees (which cannot be done since it was a worksite-level intervention) but my comment was in regards of the randomization of the sites. Although there are only two, I think the authors should mention how they were assigned to the intervention or control. In this way, there is no reason to believe that the intervention was done wherever was easier to do.

Response of the author:

Giving the response of the statistician we feel that it is not really informative to the readers if the response of the statistician is added to the discussion section. However, if the referee and the editor insist we add this information to the discussion.

We do agree with the reviewers remark on randomization on the level of the worksite. We added a comment on this item in the discussion section.
**Comment statistician:**
Both authors and the referee have got their point in terms of mixed model. The referee was right about treating centre as a random effect for cluster randomization. However, unlike a conventional cluster randomization trial where there are more than 1 cluster for each intervention, there are only 1 cluster in each arm. The centre effect would be identical to the treatment effect as replied by the authors.

However, I agree with referee 2’s comments on sample size calculation. I think it is important that the sample size calculation that was used for planning the study should be reported.

**Response of the author**
*We are glad that the issue regarding statistical analyses is resolved.*
*We added the information on the power calculation in the results section of the manuscript.*