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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

Make sure there is a detailed account of the hypothesis, rationale and methodology of a study. An accompanying discussion of why the trial was designed the way it was, is encouraged.

1. A detailed account of the study's rationale, methodology and design is provided in the manuscript. Hypotheses are not described and could be added.

2. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?

Hypotheses are not stated.

3. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?

It might be helpful providing more details about the content of the one-to-one MI session (i.e. following the structure used to describe the MI group session). Details on the intervention and follow-up (i.e. phone calls) timeline are also missing. It is not clear whether the follow-up calls will be made in the MI groups only or in all groups.

4. Is the planned statistical analysis appropriate?

More details of planned analyses could be provided. Primary and secondary outcome measures could be introduced earlier in the manuscript, in a separate section.

5. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?

N/A

6. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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