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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well written paper on an important topic. However the main aim of the paper has confused me as I am not sure if it is part of a process evaluation of the feasibility study of ARK-Hospital or is being seen as a piece of qualitative research in its own right.

Although at the start of the methods there is reference to the detail of the planning of the ARK study (ref 11), and indeed in the Introduction to the full protocol for the main trial (ref 12) the relationship of this work to these is unclear. Indeed there is more information in the abstract than in the main paper- the abstract makes clear this interview study was 'run within the feasibility study of a large cluster randomised stepped wedge trial'.

If this is the case then a clearer description of the feasibility study would be helpful, explaining what it entailed, and when patients received the leaflet (presumably part of the proposed intervention), and whether those invited to take part in this nested interview study included all the feasibility patients or a subset. Given interviews were conducted by phone there is no logistical reason why the sample should not have been drawn from all participants, if this was not the case.

Within the above overarching concerns I have the following specific comments, mostly related to clarity in describing the method.

1. Line 96 refers to future interventions but should this be for the definitive RCT that is described earlier (line 84)?

2. Input of health psychologists to the design of the leaflet is mentioned in line 102- was there a theoretical basis for the design?

3. Line 114 Again it is not clear if these potential participants are part of the feasibility study, a subset, and whether they had received the leaflet. It seems might have done and some might only have had it given at discharge? Was distribution of the leaflet timed as part of the review and revise discussion? If so was it before, during or after?
4. Line 134 refers to interviewees being asked to read, or listen to the reviewer read this leaflet. This again confuses me as to whether they had already been given the leaflet, or asked to keep it, as part of the intervention or whether knowing they had been in hospital and received antibiotics the idea of the leaflet was being tried out de novo.

5. Lines 140-142 describes the two staged action research type approach to getting feedback, amending the leaflet and getting further feedback. Again was this a priori part of the feasibility study? Was there always a target of nine pre and six post interviews and if so on what basis. if it was stage 1 interview to saturation and ditto for stage this should be describe generically in the Method with the actual number in the Results.

6. Line 142 Was this a shopping voucher?

7. line 146 Could this initial analysis on barriers be regarded content analysis?

8. In the results avoid using the same quote in the narrative text and the table eg lines 222 -224 appear in both

9. Lines 166 refer to saturation being reached but was this at both time points? ie for te first nine interviews and then the second six?

9. The first sentence of the Discussion does not appear to directly answer the first research question although it is implied.

10. In general the Discussion is written as thought this is a stand alone piece of research rather than to inform the subsequent trial. So for example line 361 onwards refer to a future study to further understand the issues rather than thinking about the implications for this programme of work.

11.Line 304-5 -something missing in the middle of this sentence

12. A limitation to consider might be the use of telephone interviews for this study when face to face ones would be likely to have yielded more indepth information and considered responses

13. Also how representative were the 15 interviewees of the study population? There is mention recruitment being challenging but some quantitative data should be available to actually define the difference

**Level of interest**

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests'

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal