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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Norton

Thank you for the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript, based on some minor revisions suggested by Reviewer 3. We agree with the reviewers suggestions and have amended the paper accordingly (please see below for our summary).

Please find attached the revised paper.

We look forward to your response.

Yours Sincerely,

Professor Fiona Bull
Director BHF National Centre for Physical Activity
School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences
1. The reviewer suggested that the NICE review paper on brief interventions on primary care should specifically be referred to in the text, rather than simply being listed as a reference.

We agree that this is an important point and should be better highlighted in the text as well as referenced. We have now added a statement that the NICE review identified brief interventions as effective. (Page 4)

2. The reviewer requests the numbers presented in Table 1 and the text in the Results be more clearly reconciled. Specifically, further clarification is needed on the patients who were included even though they were classified as ‘active’.

We agree this needed to be made more clear. To that end we have amended the text on page 9 to state clearly that of the 449 patients (a number shown clearly in Figure 2 and the sum of the subjects accounted for in Table 1) “319 (72%) were categorised as less than ‘active’ and thus eligible for LGM.” We have revised the following sentence to now explain the remaining 48 subjects as follows “Another 48 patients, classified as Active on GPPAQ, expressed an interest in LGM and were also included in the study despite being ineligible.” It is now explained how the total of patients continuing as ‘eligible and interested’ is 367 (the number shown in Figure 2).

The inclusion of ‘Active’ patients was a breach of the study protocols by the health professionals and is raised as an issue in the discussion. No changes were made to this discussion section as none were requested.

3. It was requested that a reference be added to support the use of deductive qualitative analysis.

We have now included references to Patton (2002) and Berg (2001) which provide support for the use of deductive analysis. (page 8)