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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Not sure - I am not able to assess the statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Yes - current version is technically sound
GENERAL COMMENTS:

I have got a good impression of the study. However, I wonder why the authors did not use quantitative methods for the study. In the subsequent formulary, I also state some issues to improve the manuscript.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Abstract:

Please, give a little explanation about why was the vitamin C takings your choice to assess participants' behaviour. E.g. 'during which 39 participants agreed to start taking vitamin C tablets daily for three weeks as an example of adhering to medication behavior' OR 'it is a common way to explore how people remember new behaviours or form habits'.

In the methods section, the abstract should report that both the PRMQ and the SRBAI questionnaires were used. Also, it should include that the SHRI was used in the second interview.

Background

Please give a real example of an action plan, when you mention them in Page 3 Lines 15-18.

Methods

When the authors explain the selection criteria of participants say that: "we decided to focus on younger people who we saw as less likely to have well-established long-term medication routines". Please, explain what the Authors saw to distinguish those participants who were less likely to have well-established long-term medication routines.

Procedure:

Why did the authors use semi-structured interviews instead of ad hoc quantitative questionnaires?

Results:

Please, include a table with the results from the questionnaires of each participant. Images are not relevant for the study; the Authors may exclude them.

Discussion:

Please, include more recent research in the discussion section.
References:

Please, revise the references (e.g. #20, #30, #37, …)

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I stated them above.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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