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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: My comments have been address satisfactorily.

The authors than reviewer 1 for taking the time to review the revised manuscript

Reviewer #2: The authors have done a commendable job of addressing the many reviewer comments. The coherence and structure of the paper is considerably improved. I have a couple minor comments:

Thank you, the authors also thank reviewer 2 for taking the time to review the revised manuscript

1) Lines 79-91 - there appears to be some repetition in these two paragraphs (but isn't completely clear on my hard copy if some has been deleted in tracked changes). Please check

Thank you for highlighting this, the repetition was made in error when re-structuring the original manuscript. Lines 77-81 have been deleted.

2) Line 79 - this paragraph on education seems to be out of place. It may work well to frame education as an important component for prompts to work (and situate this discussion after prompts?). The dual process theory would suggest that prompts are a post-decisional aid to encourage execution of behaviour that is already intended. Education could be framed as a
component of the pre-decisional phase where intentions to change behaviour are being formed.

Thank you for the suggestion. The paragraph on education has been moved from line 82 to line 108, below the paragraph on prompts. A couple of sentences have been added to highlight the suggestion that education may help form intentions subsequently acted on 114-118

3) Line 256-257 - it would be useful to reconsider the writing here as this reads as contradictory (not grounded in theory but then aligned with SCT)

Thank you for the suggestion. Lines 225-232 have been revised, based on this feedback.

4) Reference number in text seems to be out of sync with reference list (e.g., 48 refers to Braun and Clarke but the reference is WHO)

Thank you for highlighting this, the reference list had not updated correctly following changes made. This has now been corrected.