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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have done quite a good job at incorporating some of my and the other reviewers’ remarks in the revised manuscript. However, some major issues remain especially concerning the background and results & discussion sections, which currently limit the paper’s informativeness.

Major compulsory revisions

Background

1. The rationale for the present study still becomes not sufficiently clear from the background section. That is, it is currently still not sufficiently clear why the authors focus on smokers with a low motivation to quit smoking (i.e. why would this be considered an important target group when studying the motivational interview using conversational analysis), the link between motivational interviewing and conversation analysis appears to be rather artificial (illustrated by: ‘All of these aspects, analysed using CA (collaborative nature of the interaction, use of open-ended questions, negotiation), must be identified as Motivational Interviewing because they form part of that interaction style’), and while the authors have added some additional previous results of studies that also used CA, it still remains unclear what the added value of this particular method is.

Minor essential revisions

Abstract

1. Confusing that the authors state that ‘Motivational interviews with a subset of nine participants … . A total of 11 interviews …’. Were two respondents interviewed twice?

Results and discussion

1. It is now clearer that the first part of results presented (the part under ‘Organization of the motivational interview’) refers to the observations of motivational interviews and not only describes the ISTAPS protocol. Despite this improvement, however, especially the last part of the results and discussion section (from ‘This study has three main findings …’ onwards) is still not very
readable. This is mainly due to the authors barely using subheadings to structure the rather long text (e.g. main findings, as well as strengths and limitations could be described in separate sections with subheadings).
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