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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written and comprehensive description of a pilot study of an intervention to reduce sitting time in desk-based workers. A few suggestions for the authors:

1. It is acknowledged in the limitations that the intervention being tested is resource intensive and the findings will be used to inform a refinement of the intervention, e.g. using a computer-based intervention. This appears to be the main potential issue identified with this pilot study. While the menu of behaviour change techniques delivered as part of the intensive intervention component may be perceived by participants to be acceptable, it is possible that the delivery of these in a self-administered format will be perceived differently. Is there a plan to conduct a feasibility assessment of this modified intervention format in the next phase of the intervention development?

2. The interview schedule appears to focus on the acceptability of the behaviour change techniques. Please clarify whether the participants are also prompted to provide feedback about the acceptability of the sit-stand workstation.

3. Introduction, paragraph beginning line 95 (also relevant - line #114): the authors may wish to consider citing the Stand Up Victoria study, which is another example of a study involving environmental and individual-focused components aimed at reducing workplace sitting. Two papers that may be of relevance for this paragraph:


4. References: There appear to be a couple of issues with referencing which the authors should review. For example, reference #31 has been cited on a few occasions in the text,
but this doesn't appear to be the correct reference (see line 105). In addition, within the group of references on line 169, refs 25 and 26 refer to websites selling sit-stand workstations. These references do not appear to fit for that statement.

5. Line 374: "Participants will select..." - It was not immediately clear what was meant here. Could the authors please provide further detail to clarify.

6. A couple of minor typos were identified. Line 226 - this should be "prolonged", line 237 - delete "to", or rephrase sentence. Line 448, delete "been".
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