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## Title: Young adult smokers’ perception of the influence of physical activity on their smoking patterns

## Decision: Revise and Resubmit – The authors must address comments provided by reviewers, specifically, they must make it clear that as a qualitative study, the reader can’t make any generalizations from it, but rather it must made some statement related to how the information from this study can be transfer/be useful to other location

## 3=exceeds expectations, 2=meets expectations, 1=does not meet expectations.

**Comments:** As a guideline, any rating of "1" should receive a comment.

1. Introduction.

a. purpose of the study is communicated clearly and appropriately. 3 2 1 NA

b. need for the study is clear. 3 2 1 NA

c. relevance/significance of topic is clear. 3 2 1 NA

REMARKS: 1, 2, 1 – 3, 2, 1 – 2, 2, 1

Reviewer 1

The authors need to do a better job connecting the background of the research with the rationale and purpose of their study. For example, through their brief review of literature, they were able to support their claim that engaging in moderate to vigorous physical activity has shown to precipitate smoking cessation, however, they seem to leap without much clarity or explanation into their inquiry about ‘how to promote physical activity’ to smokers – which in turn is only distantly connected with their stated purpose: to understand smokers’ perception of how physical activity affects their smoking behavior.

Reviewer 2

Young adult smokers’ perception of the influence of physical activity on their smoking patterns

The investigation is well written and formatted. Grammar and spelling and sentence structure are good with a few exceptions. Not sure if a purpose/need for the study is clearly communicated as most references are old and no longer relevant. A larger sample size is needed or the study needs to be re-written to reflect that it is a pilot study (maybe) or that it is a study that is not generalizable. I am concerned about the strength of the study. Using only 12 participants is not a robust study. Power is not indicated and needs to be included. Were any statistics done to justify this as an adequate sample size? I did this quickly and a larger sample size is needed to make it generalizable. This can only be generalizable to the people in the study but the authors seem to think it can reach conclusions that are generalizable. With only 12 participants, the author(s) also cannot conclude the results of the study as generalizable. This statement should be that it appears to have an influence, but not that it does have influence. The overarching finding in this study is that physical activity has an influence on smoking behavior and is mediated by: a) the type of activity and b) the context of the activity.

Reviewer 3

While the study is interesting in its intent, I found the small sample size as well as the use of snowball sampling to severely limit any degree of generalizability. Also, the contradictory findings (many of the quoted respondents seemed like rationalizations more than anything) reduces its impact.

2. Literature Review. 2, 2, NA – 1, 1, 1 – 2, 2, 2

a. relevant literature is thoroughly reviewed. 3 2 1 NA

b. a hypothesis or problem statement appears

 in either the introduction or lit. review section. 3 2 1 NA

c. theoretical/conceptual framework is presented. 3 2 1 NA

REMARKS:

Reviewer 1

The review of literature was brief. Some more background information on harm reduction theory would be useful. There also needs to be some more in-depth discussion of how harm reduction theory was applied to the study.

Reviewer 2

The references are old and outdated. The authors need to find more current articles (most within the last 5 years).

Reviewer 3

No comments

3. Method.

a. subject recruitment is appropriate. 3 2 1 NA

b. instrumentation is appropriate

 (including reliability and validity). 3 2 1 NA

c. research design is appropriate. 3 2 1 NA

d. variables are explained and operationalized appropriately. 3 2 1 NA

e. data collection procedures are appropriate. 3 2 1 NA

f. data analysis is appropriate. 3 2 1 NA

REMARKS: 2, NA, 2, 1, 2, 2 – 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2 – 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2

Reviewer 1

Some variables needed definition, for example: highly physically active.

Reviewer 2

No comments

Reviewer 3

The sample size of 12 already active individuals who recruited from their social circle (snowball sampling) is a major issue. Given some of the contradictions uncovered it suggests to this reviewer that a wider net (using some form of random sampling) needs to be cast pulling in both smokers and non-smokers who are either physically active or not.

4. Results.

a. dialogue is confined to describing the results. 3 2 1 NA

b. results are described accurately. 3 2 1 NA

c. tables and graphs are mathematically correct

 and consistent with the dialogue in the results. 3 2 1 NA

REMARKS 2, 2, NA – 2, 1, 1 – 2, 2, NA

Reviewer 1

The analysis, no doubt yielded rich qualitative data, and participants’ comments should be incorporated quite a bit more. More examples supporting the various claims and some commentary about emergent themes are necessary.

Reviewer 2

Results cannot be concluded as generalizable and no recommendations can come from such a small sample size.

Reviewer 3

No comments

5. Discussion.

a. author explains the results. 3 2 1 NA

b. author relates results to the literature review. 3 2 1 NA

c. conclusions drawn are justified by the results. 3 2 1 NA

d. future research questions/directions are noted. 3 2 1 NA

 REMARKS 2, 2, 3, 3 – 1, 2, 1, 1 – 2, 2, NA, 2

 Reviewer 1

The discussion section of the study was very well crafted – the results of the study and subsequent recommendations were well-connected to the purpose of the study.

 Reviewer 2

 No comments

Reviewer 3

While there are conclusions drawn, they are very limited and circumscribed by the limited sample size.

6. Writing

a. Writing style is clear and information is well presented. 3 2 1

b. Author ascribes to APA (6th edition) style. 3 2 1

 REMARKS: 1, 1 – 2, 3 – 2, 2

 Reviewer 1

The initial sections (introduction/lit review) needed some cleaning up, in terms of writing style. And the APA format in the references needed quite a bit of work.

Reviewer 2

No comments

Reviewer 3

While the writing is straightforward for the most part, I found the purpose question to be poorly phrased: "How do smokers perceive that physical activity affects their smoking behaviour?" I might have asked: "What is the relationship between smoking behaviour (sic) and physical activity for physically active smokers?"