

Nov 05, 2008

RE: NRES-D-08-00174, titled "Effect of Intensive Education on Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Regarding Upper Respiratory Infections Among Urban Latinos"

Dear Dr. Larson,

Recently you sent your manuscript for consideration by Nursing Research. The review of your manuscript is complete and the comments of the reviewers are listed below. I will verify that this has been done upon receipt of the revised manuscript. Both reviewers noted the lack of a theoretical framework. Please include information on the conceptualization/theoretical framework of the study in your revisions.

Please include with your revised submission an itemized, point-by-point response to the comments of the reviewers. The revisions should be completed by Feb 03, 2009 to avoid being considered as a new submission.

To submit a revision, go to <http://nres.edmgr.com/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item called "Submission Needing Revision." Please click on this item to obtain your submission record and begin the revision process.

With Kind Regards,

Molly C. Dougherty, PhD, RN, FAAN  
Editor  
Nursing Research

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer #1: Overall: This is a well written manuscript focusing on health behavior and education of urban Latinos. A few revisions would help to strengthen the paper. These are described below.

**Problem Statement:** The impact of educational interventions on health behavior is an important topic for research, especially in minority populations. This study contributes to the body of health behavior research and evaluates the impact of a culture specific intervention. The authors also suggest that the cost effectiveness of the intervention needs to be evaluated. While the intervention has merit, what are the costs associated with advocating the use of these interventions in community practice? This would be an important question to consider in future research conducted by this team.

**Background Literature:** Information about background literature focuses on the underlying problem: respiratory infections. There is sufficient detail about the common cold and the need to provide information to community members to take preventive measures. What is lacking is some additional information about Latinos and vaccination. As stated on p. 4 line 22, "Despite the effectiveness of vaccination, Latinos are less likely than non-Hispanic whites to be vaccinated (.....)." No other information is provided and there is no link to the paragraph that follows.

**Theoretical framework:** There is no theoretical framework mentioned in the study. Studies that focus on education and behavior usually have underlying theoretical foundations such as Cognitive Social Learning (Bandura, 1977), Social Ecologic Theory (Bronfenbrenner 1979), Health Belief Model (Rosenstock et al., 1966). There is also no link from a theoretical perspective to the creation of the intervention. While it seems unlikely that the intervention does not have a theoretical base, it would be better to acknowledge and articulate this in the paper.

**Research Design and Method:** The research design is a pre-post evaluation of an intervention. This is articulated well, as is the sample and setting information. More information is needed about the development of the intervention and about the intervention itself. It may be helpful to include a table that provides a description of the intervention and study procedures. It appears as if the only

outcomes measured were increase in knowledge and self-reported behavior and attitude change of the participants. Again, I would have liked more information about how items were chosen and how the educational materials targeted these items. Tables 1 and 2 reflect the items under the categories knowledge, attitude and behaviors but scant information is provided about the way the intervention addressed these topics. Also, the sentence referring to the "random subsample receiving alcohol based sanitizers and/or facial masks" (p.7, line 20) has no detail regarding the rationale for this addition.

It is not enough to report that respondents were born outside of the United States and were Latino. Without knowing much about the study participants it would be difficult to evaluate external validity.

Data Analysis: The data analysis section seems straightforward. The two tables included in the manuscript are the significant results. Were there any items that did not change from pre to post assessment? Most of the quantitative analysis strategies were descriptive with the exception of multiple regression analysis. Did the demographic information include immigration information? Did respondents with less than a high school education score lower on knowledge scores than those with a high school education? What effect did knowledge have on reported practices or attitudes? These would be important questions to consider.

Results: The aim of the study was to evaluate the impact of an educational program on knowledge, attitude and practices of Latinos regarding URI's. The results section of this paper reveals that the intervention was effective for the majority of 422 households. The regression analysis did not find any significant predictors of knowledge scores. It would have been interesting to see if any demographic variables predicted increases in self-reported practices or changes in attitudes.

Discussion: In the discussion section, p 10 line 17, the respondents are referred to as recent immigrants yet no information is given about this in the demographics. The first paragraph discusses the results in light of recent arrival to the United States. This is new information not mentioned in the manuscript previously. In fact, the discussion section presents many new references and information that should have been in the introduction. I would suggest a retooling of this section reflecting the results of the study.

Organization and Style: Overall well written. I would avoid the use of the acronym "KAP" and spell out knowledge, attitudes and practices.

Summary: This manuscript addresses an important topic. Culture specific interventions need to be evaluated for efficacy and cost effectiveness. The manuscript needs to include information on the intervention and underlying theoretical framework, as well as information about immigration status of "recent Latino immigrants". The discussion section needs to be revised to reflect results of the study in context.

Reviewer #2: Thank you for allowing me to evaluate manuscript NRES-D-0800174. This research has importance for nursing. The manuscript is a well-written and scholarly contribution to nursing science.

Problem Statement: The problem is clearly stated and although we do not appear to have statistics that speak directly to the incidence and prevalence of URI in urban Latinos, the case has been made.

Relevant Literature: The literature review and background of the problem is current and sound. The sample studied is not clearly identified as existing 'outside the mainstream of the health care system,' however, and seems better educated than the subjects cited in established literature. I do not believe that this detracts from the value of the study.

Theoretical Framework: None has been described although several are possible.

Research Design: Appropriate design, with complete presentation of all aspects of the design. The authors acknowledge that this intervention may not be cost effective. IRB approval and informed

consent are described. It may have been interesting to note the time that it took subjects to complete the questionnaire.

Data Analysis: Data analysis is presented in a clear and helpful manner. It seems that educational level may have been used as a proxy for income; regardless a demographic data table would help the reader to set this sample in a clearer context.

Discussion: The discussion is thorough although it appears that this sample may not be representative of most urban Latino populations. The authors do not address this. Cost effectiveness is addressed and it would be helpful to have their thoughts on how these interventions could be more cost effective. Discussion of limitations is appropriate except for the aforementioned representativeness of the sample.

Organization: Well-organized and complete. The aim of the study (line 17 p. 2) and the principle goal (line 15 p. 10) have subtle differences. I would think that immigrated Hispanics would not necessarily be identical to urban Latinos who had been living in the US for many years.

Writing style: Well done. There are a couple of grammatical errors on p. 6. Line 25, the availability IS limited, and on line 26, the DepartmentS of Health is correct.