

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM

1st Review

Manuscript # 2004/099
Manuscript title: Treatment fidelity in behavior change research: A case example
Manuscript type: Methods
Number of text pgs.: 10
Number of figures: 0
Number of tables: 5
Reviewer: Judith W. Alexander
Stat reviewer assigned?: No -- do you recommend a stat reviewer?

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: 2
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: 5
Priority of topic for publication: 5
Rank this manuscript for its value: 5

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:

This is a timely topic, but the case example needs to be strengthened. Since this is a case study, with limited data analysis *per se*, I selected data analysis to give the low rating above.

Manuscript # 2004/099

Manuscript Title: Treatment fidelity in behavior change research: A case example

Please provide a comprehensive and integrated review of this manuscript.

Be sure to present a balanced view of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.

The manuscript is on a timely topic that has not been adequately described in the nursing literature. The authors present a nice overview of the importance of treatment fidelity and its components. Use of a case study is appropriate to explain the process of research fidelity. A few suggestions are given for improvement.

1. Information of page 7, lines 11-12 is confusing. The case study seems to be “over” with data collection at 12 months—so how was information available that indicated that one trainer continued past that time? How does that effect treatment fidelity?
2. Page 8, line 14: Provide examples of feedback that was provided to the interventionists.
3. Page 8, line 22: The nature of the informed consent by the patients is unclear. Did patients indicate in their consent their willingness and knowledge that the interventionists would be observed by a third party? Was informed consent even included in the study?
4. Page 9, Lines 5-8: Removal of a trainer from the study interesting. However, presenting this information opens several questions for the reader. Why was the trainer unwilling to follow the protocol? Did the situation have to do with the nature of the patients? What kind of information was collected about the patients? What were their demographics, SES, etc? How does this factors influence the protocol for the intervention. How does that effect treatment fidelity?
5. Page 9, line 16-17: What was the threshold to determine “intervention as intended”, so that the author(s) can conclude that “overall 92% of the time participants demonstrated evidence the they received the intervention as intended?” Are the participants here the patients or the trainers?
6. Page 10, line 8: Eleven (11) minutes of exercise over 12 months seems very small. Is this data element an outlier? Some explanation needs to be given. What is the reason for this level of noncompliance? Is this result due to patient demographics or possibly is it related to the treatment protocol? If the reason is the latter, then treatment fidelity may be compromised.