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Reviewer's report:

I have now read the revised article, along with my earlier comments and the authors' responses. Apologies for the delay. They have answered my points well, and I am much happier now that I know the paper will be published as a study protocol.

I still have some reservations about the validity of using as control those hospitals that were unable to identify opinion leaders as there must remain the suspicion that they are different in some way from those who were able to identify OLs. Ideally it might have been better to randomise similar hospitals to all three arms of the study. However, the study should still produce some very interesting and useful findings and I wish the investigators well in this important project.

I think it can now be published without further revision except for the following minor points, of which the latter two - but not the first - are optional:

1. The minor errors I mentioned last time in the two references are still there.

2. Given the status as a study protocol would it not be better to label the “results” section “preliminary results”?

3. A quibble: on page 4 the authors say that the Cochrane review on OLs "confirmed the success of social marketing". This is surely an exaggeration - they showed that there was some evidence in its favour but highlighted the lack of good evidence on this point. (Which is all the more reason for this study, by the way!)