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Reviewer's report:

Overall, the authors have addressed the majority of my concerns in a thoughtful and thorough fashion. Only a few points for consideration remain.

1. In the authors' responses to Reviewers, the authors explain they were motivated by already existing frames used in the field (UK national health services pamphlets), "..the content of our frames were driven by messages actually in use by the UK health services to maintain realism and relevance to policy making." (response to Reviewer 2, Comment #2). I suggest noting this as a limitation in the Discussion, because choosing existing frames just because they are already in use is not optimal when conducting an intervention study to systematically compare health messages.

2. The justification for eliciting risk group perception after vaccination decision (p. 16) and the ensuing application of moderation analyses continues to be troubling. Perhaps a statistician might review this approach (p. 8, lines 5-9; p. 9 lines 6-8).

3. I was confused by the addition of the Theory section (p.12-13) to "represent the above findings more formally, both as an explanation for these findings and as means to guide future studies" (p.12). The proposal that the relative salience of information may explain how a social benefit message might lower vaccination seemed to come out of nowhere. Perhaps shortening this section and including it in the Discussion as a direction for future research might be more appropriate.
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