**Point-by-point Response to Reviewer's Comments**

Thank you for the comments on our manuscript entitled "Title" (Paper No.). We appreciate the suggested modifications and have revised the manuscript accordingly. The revised sections are shown in boldface type. The detailed responses to the reviewers’ comments are presented as follows:

1) Due to the existence of many differences in different departments and different hospitals, please, clarify if the results of your study can be generalized. If not, please state it clearly as a limitation of your study.

Response: Thanks, we've added a description of how to select military hospitals. The method of selecting hospitals was cluster sampling, in which 4 clusters were randomly selected from 8 clusters (8 hospitals). Method section: page3 line 115 and 117.

2) The paper needs some language corrections. Thus, it should be proofread by a professional English language editing service.

Response: we have revised it. Page 5, line 120

3) The "Methods" section of your paper must be carefully improved. For instance, what steps have you taken to ensure validity and reliability in your study?

Response: The Persian version of the GHQ 28 questionnaire was psychometrically evaluated by Ebrahimi et al. in Iran in 2007, and Cronbach's alpha was 0.97. Also, the face and content validity were confirmed. Confirmatory factor analysis also confirmed the existence of 4 underlying dimensions.

In the present study, after confirming the face and content validity of GHQ28 by experts, the internal consistency was recalculated by Cronbach's alpha, which was equal to 0.75. Also, stability reliability was measured by measuring general health twice with a time interval of 2 weeks by calculating the intra-cluster correlation (ICC) coefficient, which was found to be 0.78. page 8, line 273-276

Reviewer Comments:  
  
Reviewer 1  
  
**Abstract section**  
In the method, there is no need to inclusion and exclusion criteria in the method section .Please bring the following items: Type of study, years and location of study, number of participants, data collection tool, statistical analysis method.

Response: Thanks. We have revised it. Line 31-34  
**Introduction section**-The introduction please tell us what weaknesses the previous studies had and now your study wants to fill these gaps.

Response: Although previous study were done on military nurse's health, but in Iran all of previous study was observational type. Our study for the first time, did a intervention on military nurse's health. We have revised it in manuscript and mention this point in line 94-99.

**Methods**What steps have you taken to ensure validity and reliability in your study?

Response: we have revised this part. In the present study, after confirming the face and content validity of GHQ28 by experts, the internal consistency was recalculated by Cronbach's alpha, which was equal to 0.75. Also, stability reliability was measured by measuring general health twice with a time interval of 2 weeks by calculating the intra-cluster correlation (ICC) coefficient, which was found to be 0.78. Page …, line 173-176.

Discussions  
Please in this section discuss the main results  with the studies conducted in this field, and what is very important is the researcher's point of view on these results.  
-In order to strengthen the introduction and discussion of these studies, it is suggested to use and, if possible, use and cite the new studies about the main variable of the study.

Response: many thanks. We have revised it. Page…, line…

Reviewer 2  
 **Abstract:**Background: You need to say one more sentence about the importance of general health of nurses in military hospitals and the importance of interventions to improve their general health. Authors should first write about general health in nurses in military hospitals and demonstrate the need for educational interventions in them.  I  recommend delete Tehran, Iran from the end of aim in abstract and  background and write Tehran, Iran in method.

Response: We have revised it. Page2….Line 25-28.

Method: The authors should explain the details of the intervention program, the sampling process and the allocation of samples to the control group in the method, as well as time of the study, and the intervals   of data collection and follow-up of the samples and data collection tools.  
I recommend removing the Inclusion criteria  and Exclusion criteria from abstract.

Response: We have revised this section. Inclusion criteria  and Exclusion criteria were removed. Because of quasi-experimental study we did not have random allocation and they were present in each of the two groups(intervention and control) based on personal interests. The one-month educational intervention included videos, pamphlets, and motivational messages about promoting general health. Page 3, line 29-38.