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Dear Mr. Silvestre and Dr. Minichiello,

We appreciate the opportunity to revise and improve our manuscript, “Motivational interview interactions and the primary healthcare challenges presented by smokers with low motivation to stop smoking: a conversation analysis” (1535319625109193). First of all, we want to thank all of the reviewers for their attention to our manuscript and for their comments, which have been very helpful. The incorporation of the changes proposed has undoubtedly improved the quality of our communication of this research. We enclose our point-by point response (in italics) to each reviewer and attach the manuscript with all changes marked in yellow.

We hope that the manuscript will now be acceptable for publication in BioMed Central.

Sincerely,

Núria Codern Bové
Escola Universitària d’Infermeria i Teràpia Ocupacional de Terrassa
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
POINT-BY-POINT REPLY TO DELWIN CATLEY

We wish to thank the reviewer for his attention to our manuscript and for his comments, which have undoubtedly helped to improve the quality of the article. We really appreciate the amount of time he dedicated to reviewing the article and for his consistently detailed comments. We are extremely grateful.

Our comments are in italics and changes in the manuscript are shown in yellow.

Reviewer's report

Title: Motivational interview interactions and the primary health care challenges presented by smokers with low motivation to stop smoking: a conversation analysis

Version: 3 Date: 21 October 2014

Reviewer: Delwyn Catley

Reviewer's report:

The authors have been responsive to the feedback provided. Suggestions for minor wording/grammatical corrections and clarifications are provided below.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

Abstract:

1. First sentence of results should be “sessions” (plural)

   Thank you for this comment. We have made the suggested change.

   Results: Motivational Interviewing sessions had three phases: assessment, reflection on readiness to change, and summary.

2. Last sentence of results should be “Motivational Interviewing”

   Thank you for this comment. We have made the suggested change.

   Interactions that did not follow Motivational Interviewing principles predominated in seven of the interviews analysed.

Introduction:

1. 3rd paragraph delete “The” from “The MI”. Search and replace “the MI” with “MI” throughout the document.

   We agree with the reviewer and have made the suggested change:

2. 3rd paragraph change “the Motivational Interview” to “MI”

   Thank you for this comment. We have made the suggested change.

   MI has attracted considerable interest because of evidence that it produces better results than brief advice.

3. 3rd paragraph change “identifying sequences” to “that identifies sequences
We agree with the reviewer and have made the suggested change:

Although this line of research is important, another approach is based on conversational analysis (CA) that identifies sequences that can offer deep insights into the interaction between the health professional and the patient.

4. 6th paragraph change “…published that examine patient-health professional interactions using CA to deliver bad news [28] and offer advice on lifestyle changes [29]…” to “….published that uses CA to examine patient-health professional interactions to deliver bad news [28] and offer advice on lifestyle changes [29]…”

We have followed the reviewer’s recommendation.

In recent years, several studies and reviews have been published that uses CA to examine patient-health professional interactions to deliver bad news [28] and offer advice on lifestyle changes [29], for example, with findings that may prove to be key to successful professional practice.

5. 11th paragraph, clarify: “must be identified as MI sessions”. Presumably “must/can be identified within MI sessions”?

We have revised the sentence as follows:

All of these aspects, analysed using CA (collaborative nature of the interaction, use of open-ended questions, negotiation), must be identified within MI sessions because they form part of that interaction style.

6. 11th paragraph clarify “make motivation more difficult”. Presumably “make motivating the patient more difficult”?

We have revised the sentence as follows:

Therefore, CA allows the analysis of specific practices that may, in our case, make motivating the patient more difficult and provide recommendations about the type of specific actions a health professional should carry out to introduce motivational elements into conversation and to improve patient satisfaction [24, 36].

Method

7. 2nd paragraph change “..their office MI and..” to “….their office MI sessions and…”

Thank you for this comment. We have made the suggested change.

Four doctors (2 males, 2 females) and one female nurse, all with more than 10 years of professional experience, agreed to record their office MI sessions and to recruit smokers.

Results
8. 1st paragraph change “…the motivational interview” to “the motivational interviewing sessions”

    Thank you for this comment. We have made the suggested change.

    The results were classified into two categories, organization of the motivational interviewing sessions and Professional MI session Practices and Actions, and subcategories with descriptive examples.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

9. First paragraph after extract 1: The authors state the professional “uses an affirmation, in the form of an open-ended question”. In traditional MI coding the statement would be coded as a reflection followed by an affirmation (there is no question asked on line 5).

    We have accepted the reviewer’s suggestion:

    Later, the professional uses a reflection followed by an affirmation, to express support and approval of a smoking cessation attempt (5) and also elicits a consent response (6).
POINT-BY-POINT REPLY TO ELINE SMIT

Reviewer's report
Nothing to add

*We wish to thank the reviewer for her attention to our manuscript.*