

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jphe-21-110>

Comment 1: In the "Abstract" section, the authors' narrative is too long. It is recommended that authors can simplify the content.

Reply 1: Authors had simplified the content of the Abstract

Changes in the text: We have simplified the Abstract as recommended (see page 1, lines 13-25)

Comment 2: In line 97, "questions" should be revised to "question".

Reply 2: "quenstions" was revised to "questions"

Change in the text: Changed to "questions" (page 3, line 71)

Comment 3: In line 127, a period should be added at the end of the sentence.

Reply 2: A period was added.

Change in the text: Added a "." At the end of the paragraph (page 5, line 108)

Comment 4: In line 125, the authors describe that the interviewees were adults over 19 years of age. However, in the "Abstract" section, the authors did describe that the interviewees were adults aged 30-50 (line 20). The authors are requested to be consistent in the representation of the interviewees. In addition, the authors should also state the total number of interviewees in this study, and describe the background of the interviewees. This approach is mainly to let readers understand that the choice of interviewees can indeed respond to the purpose of this research.

Reply 4: We have added and modified the text as advised

Changes in the text: "over 19 years of age" was changed to "Filipino adults aged 30-50 years old" (page 4, line 97). The total number of interviewees in this study (N=25) was indicated (page 4, line 97). The background of the interviewees was described as well. (pages 4-5, lines 98-102)

Comment 5: In line 143, when writing "CCM", authors are requested to write the full name

first, and then express it in abbreviations.

Reply 5: The full name of “constant comparative method” was written first followed by parenthetical (CCM).

Change in the text: Indicated: “The constant comparative method (CCM) of data analysis was the... (page 6. line 132)

Comment 6: Figure 1 is not described or marked in this manuscript. It is suggested to add an explanation in the content of the manuscript.

Reply 6: There was a typographical error. “Figure 2” indicated in the manuscript was supposedly written as “Figure 1”.

Change in the text: “Figure 2” was changed to “Figure 1”. (page 6, line 137)

Comment 7: In the “Findings” section, it is suggested to have a summary statement before the end of each phase.

Reply 7: Summary statements before the end of each phase were added.

Changes in the text: The summary statements were added as suggested (pages 10,11,14,16, corresponding lines 215-216, 246-248, 328-329, 360-361)

Comment 8: It is suggested to leave a line before and after writing interview materials. Such processing helps readers to read.

Reply 8: Lines/Spaces were made before and after participants’ verbalizations.

Changes in the text: Spaces were provided after each verbalization (pages 9-15, lines 208,213, 235,238, 241,244,259,264,271,274,277,280,282,284,308,312,321,326,342,345,348,351)

Comment 9: "..., the evidence is overwhelming that smoking cessation has major and immediate health benefits that are worth it." (Line 294-296)

It is suggested to provide evidence in the literature.

Reply 9: Evidences from literature are provided in the “Discussion” section

Changes in the text: Please see pages 18-19, lines 410-420.

Comment 10: In line 355, regarding the literature citation of "(Smith et al., 2015)", it is suggested to modify it to the literature code.

Reply 10: It has been modified to the literature code.

Change in the text: "(Smith et al., 2015)" was changed to "(27)" (page 16, line 366)

Comment 11: One of the authors' important conclusions in this study is the motivation to quit smoking. However, according to recent studies, the intensity of motivation to quit smoking may affect the compensatory health beliefs of quitters. It is suggested that the authors can do some discussion in this regard.

Reply 11: Inclusion of the discussions related to compensatory health beliefs (CHB) were included in the discussion section.

Changes in the text: Added the discussions on CHB (pages 17 & 18, lines 373-375, 397-390)

Comment 12: It is suggested to add a description of "Research Limitations and Future Research".

Reply 12: "Research Limitations and Future Research" sections were added in the manuscript.

Changes in the text: Added the two sections. (pages 20 & 21, lines 445-450, 465-473)