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Reviewer's report:

This paper is an interesting process evaluation of the Let’s get moving intervention. Whilst I think the paper is generally sound and is suitable for publication, I would like the authors to address the following as I feel it would improve the objectivity and quality of the paper for the reader.

1. Page 4 in the discussion regarding motivational interviewing in exercise settings, I would like to see a more objective critique of its use, for example, the problems identified in Breckon et al.,’s systematic review on exercise counselling and/or Johnston et al.,’s 2009 chapter in Dugdill et al's 2009 book titled PA and Health Promotion Evidence Based Approaches to practice (chapter 2) regarding a lack of parity in delivery intervention, issues of treatment fidelity etc.

2. Page 7 needs to be a reference added for inductive content analysis here. Also, if the analysis was undertaken reflecting key components of the evaluation, does this not make the analysis deductive rather than inductive? Perhaps some text to explain why and how it was inductive or perhaps it should be changed to content analysis, reflecting key components?

3. Page 7. The authors indicate a range of responses to the letters ranging from 9%, 12% and 59%. But there is little discussion of this in a discussion section. Why do they think there was such a marked difference in response from letters of invitation?

3. Page 8, the authors detail that ' patient interest was high with 70% of participants continuing through,,,,', does this mean that 70% of participants attended the next session of the brief intervention? How do they define ‘through the intervention’ at this stage? Some clarity on this would be helpful.

4. Pages 9 and 10. The authors detail the three months follow-up, and the poor response to this, 19% was because the three months was too soon. Could it be that it was too far away from the initial intervention? That it was too long a time? How does three months relate to, the responses for other interventions that have motivational interviewing in exercise, and other health care settings, for example, smoking cessation, drug rehabilitation etc. This seems to be a very low percentage of follow-up, and in my opinion needs further explanation in the context of 1. other related research that uses motivational interviewing, and 2. uptake, adherence and completion of exercise interventions, for example exercise referral schemes.
5. The discussion in general, lacks contextual discussion of the findings in the context of both other evidence using motivational interviewing, and other interventions using exercise in health care, for example adherence rates to exercise referral schemes range enormously from the reviews that have been undertaken on uptake, adherence, and completion. For example Gidlow et al., 2008; James et al., 2009 These, and others, could be integrated into the research to make it much more critical. I would like to see this section reviewed and added to.

6. Page 8 per cent discussion about the poor recruitment of ethnic minorities into the scheme, could it be that the ethnicity of the health professional was a factor? Is the other research on this? Do the authors think this is a consideration?

7. The authors discuss that there was a varied style in the delivery of the brief intervention by health care professionals, this is one of the criticisms Breckon et al, 2008 make, and I think it would be useful to incorporate their research in this debate to make it more critical. It might also be worth acknowledging that the delivery of this brief intervention could be taken outside of the surgery, as an example of an alternative method of delivery, for example using health trainers, local exercise related staff in local authorities, etc?

8. It appears to be that there is a need for further evidence regarding different recruitment methods onto the LGM intervention. If the authors are in agreement with this I would like to see added to the recommendations.
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