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: Karen Hassey Dow
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 - excellent
Attention to relevant literature: 1- well done
Theoretical framework: 1- Prochaska transtheoretical model is very appropriate
Research design: 1 very nice
Data analysis: 1- exceptional
Discussion of results: 1- clearly shows that the results are consistent with the data presented
Organization: 1- a masterpiece
Writing style: 1- wish all manuscripts were this easy to read

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

Value of topic: 5
Probable reader interest in topic: 5 for oncology researchers; perhaps 4 for other researchers
Importance of present contribution to nursing: 5 – particularly well done use of statistics; introduced important aspects of MI
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 – tell the reader more about the components of the MI
Maybe accept with revisions
Do not accept
Background and purpose: We very much know that physical activity benefits individuals. The particular emphasis on cancer survivors is an important one. While many studies focus on physical activities, this one focuses on motivational interviewing that is new. It would have been helpful if the author(s) had some discussion about ‘conversations” about MI (p4, line4) to help educate the reader.

Literature review: was well described. Very pertinent review with a multidisciplinary focus.

Design, methods, interventions: I was skeptical about the large effect size projected .83. Results showing a smaller effect size was more reasonable. Motivational interviewing intervention needs further discussion. Exactly what was in the components and how were they tailored for the individual – since this is the intervention (and it differs from psychoeducational intervention), it is important to tell the reader exactly what comprised MI. Outcome variables were nicely described. MLM with intent to treat analysis were appropriate and beautifully written. The discussion about data analysis was superb.

Results: another strength as the results clearly did not go beyond the data; I also liked that the limitations were very well spelled out.

Implications: clean

Presentation: tables enhanced the text

All in all, an excellent and well written paper that will make an excellent contribution to the literature.