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Reviewer's report:

Response to Reviewers

The authors have done a good job in responding to my concerns pertaining to issues in the Major Compulsory Revisions and Discretionary Revisions sections of the original review. As a result, the revised manuscript, in my opinion, is much stronger. However, just a few points of clarification are further needed, and these can be classified as Minor Essential Details.

Major Compulsory Revisions

None noted

Minor Essential Details

1. The authors provide a good rationale for using Primary Care as a public health intervention to boost physical activity in adults. In response to my desire for them to justify the use of brief interventions, they have added these citations in the Introduction. In the response to reviewers letter, authors claim that the NICE review paper provides good justification for using brief intervention in primary care, but this should be explicitly stated in the paragraph rather than simply referencing this paper.

2. Regarding my 3rd comment under Major Compulsory Revisions, the authors attempt to clarify inclusion criteria based on the GPPAQ by adding a column in Table 1. However, this column indicates that n=319 subjects are eligible based on GPPAQ physical activity data; however, in Figure 2, they report that n=367 subjects are eligible and interested in participating in the study. Thus, these discrepancies in amount of subjects who are eligible need to be reconciled.

3. Regarding my first comment in the Discretionary revisions concerning the reference to a model in which inductive qualitative methods were used, authors provide good rationale for using deductive qualitative methods, as desired by another reviewer. However, there is no reference or mention of the deductive model of qualitative methodology used, and this reference is needed to strengthen and validate the methodological approach taken.

Discretionary Revisions

None noted
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