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Reviewer's report:

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:

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

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.

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)

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)
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