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Dear Editor Victorino Silvestre,

We wish to thank the Editor and the Reviewer for the constructive comments and valuable suggestions. We have addressed the Reviewer’s concerns and revised the manuscript in light of the comments, as accounted for in the enclosure. To highlight the changes in the manuscript, track changes in MS words has been used for revisions.

Yours sincerely,

Malin Axelsson

Ph.D. Student
University of Gothenburg
Krefting Research Centre
Box 424
SE-405 30 Göteborg
Sweden

Visiting address: Medicinaregatan 1G
Phone +46(0)31 786 67 16
Fax +46(0)31 786 67 30
Reviewer's report

Title: Motivational foci and medication tactics directed towards a functional day: A qualitative study of adherence behaviour in young adults with asthma

Version: 1 Date: 20 June 2011

Reviewer: Chantal Raherison

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The research question posed by the authors is very interesting and well defined. The aim of the study was to elucidate adherence reasoning in relation to asthma medication.

2. In the methods, analysis is described in details, however the authors should explained why they didn’t use conventional statistical to verify their hypothesis as factorial analysis or cluster analysis.
   - **We thank the Reviewer for this comment. In the revised version of our manuscript, we have given an explanation of why the theoretical model was not validated statistically. Please see the discussion page 19.**

3. The presentation of the data is one of the limits of the manuscript. The data should be more described in details.
   - For example, how many patients were considered in each regulatory foci, number of patients, gender, severity and control of asthma, means of age, follow-up by Gp or specialist, previous educational program for their asthma etc., smoking habits, experience of severe asthma attack, social class, hospitalizations, emergency visits, duration of asthma,
   - Did the authors think the three approach are independent from each other, or did they observed some link between the different foci?
   - **We fully appreciate that the presentation of background data was scanty in our previous manuscript and thank the Reviewer for this remark. Table 1 has been extended to include requested data. Please see page 29. Unfortunately, we did not collect any data on severity and control of asthma, follow-up by GP, previous educational program and experience of severe asthma attack, which the Reviewer also asked for. The Reviewer also requested information on how many interviewees that were considered in each foci. Our answer is that the three foci are based on interview data not on a specific number of interviewees, which is a normal procedure in qualitative research. We have explained this more thoroughly in the discussion, please see page 19.**

4. The discussion and conclusions are not well balanced and adequately supported by the data.
   - **We agree with the Reviewer’s comment and have therefore revised the discussion as well as the conclusion, please see the abstract page 2, the discussion page 18 and the conclusion page 21.**

5. Limitations of the work are not clearly stated particularly on the size of the study, and the lack of description data for the three groups.
   - **We thank the Reviewer for this comment. We have made a clarification of the method used and the section in the discussion stating the study limitations have been revised, please see page 19-20.**
6. the title and abstract are accurately convey however, the title should be Shortened
   •  We thank the Reviewer for this comment and we have shortened the title.

Yours sincerely.