Reviewer's report

Title: Qualitative evaluation of primary care providers experiences of a training programme to offer brief behaviour change counselling on risk factors for non-communicable diseases in South Africa

Version: 4 Date: 11 June 2015

Reviewer: Navjeet Mangat

Reviewer's report:

I think this is a good study. It is short term but the results are promising. I think this paper could be considered for publication after the authors have addressed the issues listed below:

Major Compulsory Revisions
Could the authors please state whether they reached saturation within the results.

While the discussion is overall good and interesting, it seems to focus too much on the organizational barriers to BBCC being implemented. It is commented on in the results, and should be discussed. But, it was not the only issue. I would like there to be a more rounded discussion sticking to results obtained. This should include such topics as: how they might address difficulties in experience in switching to the ‘new approach’, and how to get around any potential barriers to access (e.g. language).

Line 441: There is a specific paragraph dedicated to the limitations of the article. Within this the major limitation as I see it, the short term follow, is only given 2 sentences. Given the amount of space used for debating the organizational barriers to BBCC being implemented, this is a surprise given that the authors admit that attitudes and practices can change over time (and revert back to type), a long term reassessment of participant attitudes is paramount to knowing whether to adopt BBCC more widely (as the authors later discuss e.g. in medical schools). I would like to know whether there is any plan to repeat the study at a later date so to address this issue.

Finally, is there any cost effectiveness data available for this programme?

Minor Essential Revisions

Line 448: Reference of previous papers by the author needed here.

Discretionary Revisions

Line 193: This is an international journal and we are not all privy to the workings of the SA health service. It would be useful to know the difference between a Family Physician and a General Practitioner. Is it just a matter of public vs
private?

Line 214: An interview guide was used and there is some information as to what was asked and how things proceeded from there. Can the authors provide the Guide in the appendix?
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