

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	PARTICIPANTS' PERSPECTIVES ON MAKING AND MAINTAINING BEHAVIOUR CHANGES IN A LIFESTYLE INTERVENTION FOR TYPE 2 DIABETES PREVENTION: QUALITATIVE STUDY USING THE THEORY DOMAIN FRAMEWORK
AUTHORS	Penn, Linda; Dombrowski, Stephan; Sniehotta, Falko; White, Martin

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	<p>Rhys Williams Emeritus Professor of Clinical Epidemiology College of Medicine Swansea University Swansea SA2 8PP United Kingdom</p> <p>I have no competing interests.</p>
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Apr-2013

THE STUDY	<p>It is claimed that the subjects were 'purposively sampled for physical activity increase' and yet, if I have understood Table 1 correctly, some of the participants increased their physical activity (e.g. participant A) and others did not (e.g. participant D).</p> <p>The participants aren't representative but this type of investigation does not require that.</p> <p>Statistical methods are not appropriate here since this is a qualitative, not a quantitative, study.</p>
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	It is not explained why 15 participants were studied. There is no justification of this number in terms of the emergence of themes.
REPORTING & ETHICS	Checklists such as CONSORT are not appropriate in this context.

REVIEWER	<p>Dr. Jaana Lindström Research Manager Diabetes Prevention Unit National Institute for Health and Welfare Finland</p> <p>I declare that I have no competing interests.</p>
REVIEW RETURNED	22-May-2013

THE STUDY	This is a qualitative and descriptive study without a specific outcome and thus no statistical analyses are required.
------------------	---

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a nicely written paper addressing a very important theme: how to facilitate the translation of findings from clinical trials to real-life setting. The data consists of 15 semi-structured interviews of successful participants in a pilot study aimed at behavioral change, especially increased physical activity. Asking the participants' perceptions is a very informative but largely neglected method to collect valuable information to improve lifestyle interventions. To a non-psychologist, the use of the theory domain framework in the analysis of the interview data seems appropriate and justified and allows the structured interpretation of the findings. A specific strength of the study is that the participants were chosen from relatively deprived areas and thus represented the perceptions of the people considered most at risk but difficult to reach. A limitation is the low number of interviews, also acknowledged by the authors. The findings presented in the paper are useful for others planning community interventions to change behavior but also to research groups who plan to carry out similar process evaluation within their own study populations.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Response to reviewer 1

Thank you for your comment about the statement 'purposively sampled for physical activity increase' I appreciate that this is not clear in the paper.

Eight of the interviews were conducted when the participants had completed 12 months follow-up and the other seven interviews were conducted earlier than this to ensure inclusion from different participant groups (ie not just all those who joined the programme together). I have clarified this in the text and by adding to Table 1. All participants in this interview study had increased their physical activity at 6 months follow-up, however participant D, who was interviewed after they had completed 6 months follow-up did not maintain their increase in physical activity at 12 months.

Thank you for highlighting a need for 'Justification for 15 participant interviews'

I have added the following to the results section, "After analysis of 15 interview transcripts there were no new themes relevant to the research question (i.e. relating to participants' perspectives of their behaviour change or of engaging features of the programme) emerging from the data." The focus on themes relevant to the research questions was resource driven.

Response to reviewer 2

Thank you for your appreciation of the importance of eliciting participant perspectives and for your agreement with regard to the use of the theory domains framework. We believe that applying this structure informed the analysis and we hope it will be useful for others who plan similar process evaluations as you suggest.