

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) 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)	Perspectives on enhancing physical activity and diet for health promotion among at risk urban UK South Asian communities: qualitative study
AUTHORS	Cross-Bardell, Laura; George, Tracey; Bhoday, Mandeep; Tuomainen, Helena; Qureshi, Nadeem; Kai, Joe

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Mark R D Johnson Emeritus Professor of Diversity in Health & Care Mary Seacole Research Centre, De Montfort University Leicester, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Jan-2015

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a useful and timely paper. I am impressed by the vivid 'vox pop' verbatim transcript quotes, and the ability to get useful data from health professionals, including a selection of roles and a decent input of bilingual/SA colleagues.</p> <p>There are no real surprises for any reader who is deeply immersed in the Multicultural Health Promotion scene, but it is really good to see this in print (or it should be!). The paper usefully underlines the continuity of challenges to practice despite earlier expectations of 'assimilation', and the central role of culture/eating, issues about personal safety and cost in exercise, the centrality of the need to build on existing sociabilities.</p> <p>The term 'the lack of theory' might be challenged - the authors quote the work by Liu, Netto, Bhopal etc. Personally, having been involved in the analysis of the Health Survey for England and other earlier HEA data (nearly 20 years ago), my feeling is that there has been a lack of implementation and testing, of published evaluation of trials - this paper makes a start to remedy that, I think.</p> <p>No major concerns, or even suggestions for inclusion - word limits etc would prevent a more historical approach, and what is needed now is action not reflection.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Harsimran Singh California State University, Fullerton, California, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Jan-2015

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I read the manuscript with great interest and believe that it makes a useful contribution to the current literature on SAsian health. However, I have a few minor concerns and would encourage the authors to address these:</p> <p>(1) I was unable to find ethics or consent information in the manuscript.</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>(2) There is a spelling error in the "Results" section of the abstract (should be career instead of carer)</p> <p>(3) There have been more recent publications in the literature recently that have suggested issues surrounding diet management, stigma around diabetes etc. I would encourage you to review those too. E.g., Support systems for and barriers to diabetes management in South Asians and Whites in the UK: qualitative study of patients' perspectives by Singh et al, 2012 in BMJ Open.</p> <p>(4) It would be useful to have a comment by the authors in the discussion on how acculturated they thought their SAsian sample was...this would give a more holistic context to the findings. From the sample description, I am assuming a relatively lower level of acculturation? Additionally, it is essential to highlight in the discussion that the sample was assembled from a deprived area of the UK. This has been mentioned in the methods section, however, the authors should detail this so that the readers have a better understanding of the section of the SAsian population they were working with. The concerns that surfaced as part of this study (based on the population) might be different from SAsian population in an affluent part of the Country. This also has implications for interventions that might be planned for this population.</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer Name Mark R D Johnson
 Institution and Country Emeritus Professor of Diversity in Health & Care
 Mary Seacole Research Centre, De Montfort University
 Leicester, UK
 Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None

This is a useful and timely paper. I am impressed by the vivid 'vox pop' verbatim transcript quotes, and the ability to get useful data from health professionals, including a selection of roles and a decent input of bilingual/SA colleagues.

There are no real surprises for any reader who is deeply immersed in the Multicultural Health Promotion scene, but it is really good to see this in print (or it should be!). The paper usefully underlines the continuity of challenges to practice despite earlier expectations of 'assimilation', and the central role of culture/eating, issues about personal safety and cost in exercise, the centrality of the need to build on existing sociabilities.

The term 'the lack of theory' might be challenged - the authors quote the work by Liu, Netto, Bhopal etc. Personally, having been involved in the analysis of the Health Survey for England and other earlier HEA data (nearly 20 years ago), my feeling is that there has been a lack of implementation and testing, of published evaluation of trials - this paper makes a start to remedy that, I think.

No major concerns, or even suggestions for inclusion - word limits etc would prevent a more historical approach, and what is needed now is action not reflection.

---We agree with, and appreciate these comments. As noted in the paper (Discussion) we are indeed proceeding to action - with implementation and testing.

Reviewer Name Harsimran Singh
 Institution and Country California State University, Fullerton, California, USA
 Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

I read the manuscript with great interest and believe that it makes a useful contribution to the current literature on SAsian health. However, I have a few minor concerns and would encourage the authors to address these:

(1) I was unable to find ethics or consent information in the manuscript.

----Ethics approval information provided at the end of the paper as required, prior to References

(2) There is a spelling error in the "Results" section of the abstract (should be career instead of carer)

----In fact, 'carer' is intended (i.e. commitments to caring for children or other relatives)

(3) There have been more recent publications in the literature recently that have suggested issues surrounding diet management, stigma around diabetes etc. I would encourage you to review those too. E.g., Support systems for and barriers to diabetes management in South Asians and Whites in the UK: qualitative study of patients' perspectives by Singh et al, 2012 in BMJ Open.

----Reference to this example of recent literature has been added in the Discussion (third para) – tracked and new reference (#30) highlighted.

(4) It would be useful to have a comment by the authors in the discussion on how acculturated they thought their SAsian sample was...this would give a more holistic context to the findings. From the sample description, I am assuming a relatively lower level of acculturation? Additionally, it is essential to highlight in the discussion that the sample was assembled from a deprived area of the UK. This has been mentioned in the methods section, however, the authors should detail this so that the readers have a better understanding of the section of the SAsian population they were working with.

---The nature of the sample – including 'non-English speakers' and 'urban disadvantaged' - is highlighted again in Discussion (second paragraph) as well as previously in Methods (which includes educational attainment, preferred language and self-defined ethnicity – none refer to themselves as 'British' Asian). Deprived context is highlighted again in the final paragraph of the Discussion.

The concerns that surfaced as part of this study (based on the population) might be different from SAsian population in an affluent part of the Country. This also has implications for interventions that might be planned for this population.

---The nature of the target population for intervention – as inner city deprived – is highlighted in all sections of the paper.