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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript, which will be of interest to readers who are planning to improve emergency department practice based on behaviour change interventions.

This is a well written manuscript and a comprehensive account of the effectiveness study, including a full account of the study's limitations.

A few minor observations that might be considered by the authors:

- Re recruitment to the study, whilst it is acknowledged that self selection was a limitation, I wasn't entirely clear from the text in the manuscript [lines 205-207] how the ED director's consent to be involved in an either/or intervention played through in terms of how those sites were then allocated to an intervention [without referring to a supplementary file] - adding a little more detail here would be helpful - perhaps with clearer linkage to the minimisation approach.

- With respect to the intervention - I appreciate the content of the intervention is in a supplementary file and the development reported elsewhere, but it would be helpful to know within the text of the manuscript what the underlying theory/theories were about the intended mechanisms of action of the interventions.

- lines 444 - cost is mentioned, but there is no economic analysis reported in this manuscript.

I appreciate that the process evaluation findings will be the subject of a further manuscript, but it is a shame that the reader does not get at least a hint of some of the explanation behind the findings...
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