

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM

1st Review

Manuscript # 2006/043
Manuscript title: Motivational interviewing to increase physical activity in long-term cancer survivors: A randomized controlled trial
Manuscript type: Regular
Number of text pgs.: 12
Number of figures: 4
Number of tables: 4
Reviewer: Janet L. Larson
Stat reviewer assigned?: Yes - a stat reviewer will be assigned

Please evaluate the following with these choices: (1) adequate, (2) inadequate (describe in written review) or (3) not appropriate (describe in written review)

Problem statement: 1
Attention to relevant literature: 1
Theoretical framework: 1
Research design: 1
Data analysis: 1
Discussion of results: 1
Organization: 1
Writing style: 1

Please rate the following topics 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rating):

Value of topic: 5
Probable reader interest in topic: 5
Importance of present contribution to nursing: 3
Priority of topic for publication: 4
Rank this manuscript for its value: 4

Reviewer's Recommendation (please type "X" after your choice):

Accept without revisions
Accept with revisions X
Maybe accept with revisions
Do not accept

Comments for Editor only:

**Please provide a comprehensive and integrated review of this manuscript.
Be sure to present a balanced view of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.**

This research addressed an important topic that has been recently recognized as a major concern, the health promotion of cancer survivors. The manuscript is well organized and clearly written. The abstract is well organized and clearly written, but it does not mention the actual instruments used for data collection. This makes it less informative and it creates problems with electronic searches, making it difficult to identify studies that used these instruments.

This research was grounded in a solid theoretical framework, transtheoretical model and self-efficacy theory. The motivational interviewing is a promising intervention and it appears to have been done in a systematic manner, though the nature of the tailoring is not clearly described. It is described in very vague terms on page 4 lines 4-5 and it would not be possible to replicate this intervention from that description. Subjects were given pedometers, but the manufacturer and model was not described. This is important because there is a very wide range of pedometers, some of which are extremely inaccurate and others are acceptable.

The experimental research design is a positive feature of this research, but some information is missing. The abstract indicates that subjects were randomly assigned but this was not described in the body of the text. The method of randomization should be reported. Figure 1 was not part of the document submitted for review so it is not possible to critique the flow of subjects through the study. The data collector was not blinded to group assignment and this is a weakness of the research methods, but it was appropriately acknowledged in the text.

The outcome measures are appropriate for this research, particularly the 6 minute walk and the SF-36. Subjects reported their level of physical activity using the Community Healthy Activities Model Program for Seniors (CHAMPS) and this is an appropriate questionnaire, but the problems with self-reported physical activity data were not addressed. It is possible that the intervention increased subjects' awareness of the importance of physical activity and changed their reporting behavior with little change in physical activity behavior. This is one plausible explanation of the findings. This research still has value, but it is important to address this limitation and to recommend objective measures of physical activity in future research.

The statistical methods are appropriate and clearly described. The results section includes much information that is redundant to the tables and this text needs to be streamlined. Figure 2 could be deleted. It is presented as part of a tutorial and is not needed to describe the results. A bit of clarification is required on page 9, lines 20-22. It is not clear which dependent variable is being discussed. Table 1 could be reorganized to reduce its complexity by moving descriptors from column 2 and 3 to column 1.

The discussion is interesting and informative, but it should include the limitations associated with self-reported physical activity data.

Page 5, line 10. "We deleted one item 2 about... This is confusing.

Page 11, line 21. Change "an mean increase" to "a mean increase".

Page 11, lines 7 and 14. There is a question mark in each line.