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: Fulkerson, Jayne
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: 2 (see nonstatistical comments)
Theoretical framework: 1
Research design: 2
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: 4
Probable reader interest in topic: 4
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Methods/Statistical Review

This manuscript is a well written description of a motivational interviewing randomized controlled trial to increase physical activity in long-term cancer survivors. The use of a multilevel analysis was appropriate for the study and is well described. There are several limitations in this study, and most are addressed adequately in the discussion section. However, several methodological issues make it difficult to assess the quality of this study.

1) No validity or reliability information is provided for outcome or descriptive variables. The lack of this information precludes the reader from understanding the value of these measures and how the findings may or may not have been affected by measurement quality. Were the null findings for fitness, mental health, physical health and fatigue influenced by poor measurement of these constructs? Are the CHAMPS scores valid as self-report? Poor psychometric properties should be addressed as a limitation in the discussion section.

2) What method was used to determine caloric expenditure for various activities? There are several methods available, with varying degrees of validity, and the method used should be referenced.

3) Were any statistical methods used to test outcome differences between the two counselors? Perhaps the first counselor was more experienced and had better or different outcomes.

4) Are there any differences in outcomes if the few male participants are removed from the analyses? It would seem logical to only include females since there is evidence in previous research that the outcomes vary by gender, and very few males participated in the present study.

Non-statistical comments/questions

- What is the meaning of the “role-physical” and “role-emotional” scales (see p. 5)?
- Figure 1 was not included in the reviewer materials.
- Why wasn’t the Pinto et al., 2005 study described in the discussion referenced in the introduction? It seems very similar to the present study with the exception of the length of illness.
- Who collected the height and weight data? What method was used and how was the person trained?