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REVIEWSER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: This study aims to identify attendance barriers experienced in a workplace health promotion programme for female health care workers using semi-structured interviews and inductive qualitative analysis. The authors should be commended on the overall written quality of the manuscript and detailed documentation of the coding process provided in the additional files. The manuscript highlights an ongoing challenge regarding workplace health promotion - enrollment and sustained engagement. Particularly in workplace settings which are not homogenous environments, for which a 'one size fits all' approach may not be effective. The main limitation of this research is the small sample size and lack of diversity in the population which limits the generalizability of the findings. Some methodological clarity is needed throughout to better guide the reader.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Methodology

1. It is understood that semi-structured interviews may yield rich insights. However, it is unfortunate that a tenth participant was not pursued. The authors only mention the lack of diversity as a limitation and should perhaps mention the low sample size - or better justify the sample size.

2. Clarification regarding the recruitment of interviewees is required - e.g., were all participants asked? Were incentives offered? Were specific individuals selected and if so, why? Is there any concern that those that volunteered to participate in the interviews represented only those with extreme views? The authors do not provide this information, nor discuss the potential implications.

3. Did the authors use any software for the qualitative analysis? E.g., NVivo?
Discussion

4. It may be important for the authors to reiterate findings do not necessarily inform strategies to increase overall reach and participation in the programme as it only represents those who did participate. The authors may wish to discuss the scope for future work that collects both reasons for a) not enrolling and; b) poor attendance, to identify any overlap.

5. The discussion could be improved by providing a statement at the end of each paragraph (e.g., organizational, intervention, and individual factors), to suggest methods to avoid/account for these factors. This may better prepare the reader for the conclusions.

Conclusion

6. Why only organizational and intervention factors? The results suggest that personal factors were identified by 7 participants. Authors should better justify this statement and/or rework the conclusion section.

7. Page 17, Line 52-57. This concluding sentence does not serve as a good, summative statement. The conclusions section may be improved by replicating the flow of the discussion (once more summary statements have been added to the discussion) to guide the reader.

Grammatical

8. Page 11, Line 49. Change 'planed' to 'planned'.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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