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The Editor

BMC Public Health
BioMed Central
236 Gray’s Inn Road
London WC1X 8HB
United Kingdom

Dear Editor

Re: MS 5061862751604103 - Development of a text message intervention aimed at reducing alcohol-related harm in patients admitted to hospital as a result of injury

Further to our previous cover letters (February and June 2015), thank you for considering this revised manuscript for publication in *BMC Public Health*. We are very grateful for the comments of the reviewers and attach a table outlining our response to the two additional comments and concerns.

Thank you for considering this manuscript for publication in *BMC Public Health*.

Yours sincerely

Dr Sarah Sharpe MBChB, MPH, FNZCPHM
Thank you for the further reviews of this manuscript. We have responded to the points raised and summarised this in the table below.

REVIEWER TWO: Brian Suffoletto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points made</th>
<th>Location in original submission</th>
<th>Authors response</th>
<th>Location in revised submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major compulsory revisions:</td>
<td>Interviewer guide not provided</td>
<td>A summary of the interviewer guide has been provided in Appendix 1</td>
<td>Appendix 1, pp 29-30, and referred to in Methods, line 217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Please include as an appendix the interviewer guide.

2. On re-read, I am newly aware that this proposed intervention is really on the far end of the spectrum of complexity for mHealth behavioural platforms. It essentially is a "push-based" program of extremely low intensity. Given that mHealth interventions have largely been shown to have small, if any, effect sizes, how do the authors justify such a simple, low-intensity, low-personalization, short-term program? Please address head-on the above concern about low-intensity mHealth program.

A sentence has been added to paragraph 5, which we believe addresses the concern about a low-intensity program. The concept for this mHealth intervention is based on BI, which is by definition ‘brief’, i.e. the mHealth intervention is intended to be low-intensity. Our study could be viewed as an approach that distils BI to its core information elements. Whether this is effective or not is a question for a formal evaluation, which is underway.

Discussion, line 547-548

We also have noted our own typo mistake in line 111 “856% for Pacific Peoples” and have changed this to “85% for Pacific Peoples”