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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The scene is set nicely in the introduction section to provide a sound rationale of the need for interventions to reduce/interrupt workplace sitting. However, there needs to be more detail in the final paragraph. There is mention of "the literature" regarding an intervention that integrates self-management and includes tailoring constructs, but the reader needs to understand what you mean by this and what the literature is telling you. In addition, given the paper is looking at the acceptability and feasibility of an intervention, more detail should be provided rather than simply "Important aspects in the process of intervention development are the evaluation of the feasibility and acceptability of potential intervention strategies in particular contexts and target groups".

2. There needs to be a "Study Design" section in the methods, which is currently absent. As such, the reader cannot easily determine whether the methods used are appropriate or not. The methods would have benefitted from a mixed methods approach.

3. Were there any elements of co-production with the intervention development, or was it developed by the researchers only? If so, please include details of the co-production methods used. If it wasn't used, this needs to be included as a limitation of the study, as the use of co-production may have resulted in some of the barriers to the intervention being addressed during the development phase.

4. As the study was not aiming to determine an effect size of the intervention in terms of reducing/interrupting workplace sitting time, there was no need to do a formal power calculation. However, I think this study could be improved by including pre- and post-intervention data on workplace sitting time to provide an initial assessment of effectiveness, although it would not likely be statistically significant. By including these data, it would make this study a more comprehensive pilot.

5. In the discussion about the acceptability of the intervention, it is stated that the "authors assumed it would be a strength to split up the advice into separate sections to be requested when suitable for the users, only 8.5% of the employees thought it was useful". This demonstrates why a co-production approach may have been beneficial and hence warrants some discussion here.
6. There are typographical and grammatical errors throughout the paper which would need to be addressed prior to publication e.g. in the background section, the use of the word scare instead of scarce. Also the use of English is at times a little colloquial rather than academic.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. There are a couple of missing recent references that the paper may benefit from including:

2. The data presented appear to be sound and statistical analyses seem to be appropriate. However, in the penultimate paragraph of the results section, the final sentence needs clarifying/rewriting as it does not make sense in its current form. The tables appear to be appropriate and clearly display the data.

3. Generally, I feel that the strengths and limitations sections need more detail. It might be worth discussing why questionnaires were used to measure the acceptability of the study rather than focus groups/interviews, as this would have provided more detailed information to inform the future development of this intervention. It would also be useful to discuss the benefits of co-production in intervention development. It might also be helpful to discuss the benefits of multi-component interventions.

4. When discussing the fact that this web-based, computer-tailored intervention had a high initial response rate (i.e. those requesting advice), there is then a comparison with response rates from studies using similar interventions, which are all substantially lower. However, it is not entirely clear why this study might have had a higher initial response rate. This information possibly could have been obtained if qualitative work had also been carried out.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. The title might read better if changed to: "Theory-driven, web-based, computer-tailored advice to reduce and interrupt workplace sitting: development, feasibility and acceptability testing among employees".

2. I think that the question of this study is: "Is a theory-driven, web-based, computer-tailored intervention feasible and acceptable to employees in reducing/interrupting workplace sitting?". This does seem to be an appropriate and well-defined question.

3. The first sub-heading in the methods section could read "Development of the theory-driven, web-based, computer-tailored intervention".

4. When you talk about reducing and interrupting sitting time I think it can get a
little confusing for the reader. It would seem to me that reducing sitting time is the overall aim and the methods of doing the are either by interrupting and/or replacing workplace sitting time. Maybe this needs to be a little clearer.

5. You talk about decision rules - could you clarify, as I do not know what is meant by these?

6. A figure displaying the procedure might be worth considering to clarify the understanding of the methods.

7. The figure presented in the paper appears to be genuine. The only issue to be mindful of is the way the response rates have been calculated. It might be more appropriate for the denominator to be 179 throughout.

8. With any technology-based interventions, there is always a propensity to increase health inequalities. This maybe warrants some discussion.
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