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Thank you for addressing the suggestions that were made in this revised version of the manuscript, it’s looking excellent. There are a few points that I think it would be useful to clarify in more detail although these are overwhelmingly discretionary.

Minor Essential Revisions

Title
1. Change ‘use’ to ‘using’

Participants
2. I would not use percentages here – it doesn’t feel appropriate with such a small sample size and is a quantitative approach to data analysis.

Discussion

Discretionary Revisions

Abstract
4. In the abstract you might want to outline how you undertook purposive sampling in more detail. For instance the sample included ‘readers’ and ‘non users’ and what this means.

Data collection
5. Why was a decision made to exclude interviews that were video taped? Why
did you decide to video tape the interviews if they weren’t going to be used?

6. Although this point has largely been addressed it might be useful to be even clearer about what the I-Change model is, e.g. ‘it postulates that behaviour is the result of a person’s intention which is influenced by four factors: motivation, awareness, information and predisposing variables such as…’

7. It would be useful to have a bit more detail about why the I-Change model was selected. I know this is partially explained but why is it useful to choose a framework that incorporates insights of several behavioural models?

8. Again this is just an issue of clarity but it would be useful to be more clear about how the topic guide was structured, e.g. ‘it was structured around the four constructs of the I-Change model: behaviour, in this case booklet use, motivation, awareness factors and information. It also included a question on suggestions for improvement.’ It would also be useful to explain what ‘motivation’, ‘awareness factors’ and ‘information’ mean in this context as I am not sure about this.

9. Since there is always going to be some degree of prejudice in the questions being asked in semi-structured interviews and how the data is interpreted, I would leave out the statement ‘with minimal prejudiced interpretation of the researchers’.

Data analysis

10. I don’t think it’s necessary to mention that readers were categorised into ‘non-users’ or ‘readers’ at this stage as it does not make sense if it is not fully explained and a full explanation is provided in the results section.

Results

Booklet use

11. Perhaps you might want to discuss how dividing readers into ‘non users’ and ‘readers’ could influence the barriers and facilitators experienced by patients. I’m assuming that this was the primary reason that you made this distinction.
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