

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.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Tearing down the barriers to exercise after mastectomy: A qualitative inquiry to facilitate exercise among breast cancer survivors
AUTHORS	Yeon, Sujin; Jeong, Ansuk; Min, Jihee; Byeon, Jiyong; Yoon, Yong Jin; Heo, Jinmoo; Lee, Chulwon; Kim, Jeeye; Park, Seho; Kim, Seung Il; Jeon, Justin

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Hasenoehrl, Timothy Medical University of Vienna, Department of Physical Medicine, Rehabilitation and Occupational Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Jan-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The current manuscript is a carefully designed qualitative study about the barriers and facilitators for exercising after breast cancer surgery. The article is well written and fulfils international quality standards.</p> <p>I therefore only have some minor recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Methods section, page 6, lines 48 to 60 into page 7, lines 4-6, paragraph "Patient and Public Involvement": In my personal opinion, this paragraph does not add any substantial value to the article and is too much storytelling for a research article.• Methods section, page 8, lines 48 60 into page 9, line 4, paragraph "Characteristics of Researchers": I understand that this paragraph is supposed to raise the credibility of this project by referring to the experience and expertise of the researchers involved. However, I do not think that this adds substantial value to this article. The methodological quality of your study speaks for itself.• Methods section: After reading the article, there is still one thing which is not 100% clear to me: Did the patients receive any exercise recommendations respectively exercise support at any time of the study?• Discussion section, page 17, line 30: You wrote, "There was no disagreeing among the participants...". I would suggest phrasing it differently, in a positive instead of a negative way: E.g. "The participants agreed..."• Conclusion section, page 19: I miss one key point in your conclusion, namely the patients' need for homogeneous exercise recommendations throughout all health care professions and hence the need to educate all health care professionals who are in contact with breast cancer patients about the current state of knowledge regarding exercising after BCS.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Oldervoll, Line
-----------------	-----------------

	Universitetet i Bergen
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Feb-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The current study investigated the factors related to exercise promotion within one month after BCS. Additionally, the authors also aimed to complement the intentions expressed in the interviews quantitative data on PA.</p> <p>The paper is interesting and well-written and includes both qualitative data and quantitative data on physical activity level from before surgery and three times after surgery.</p> <p>One minor comments concerning the statistical analysis - the analysis performed is limited described - please describe what type of analysis you have performed in more detail. In the result section report that "Analysis revealed that the total PA level statistically significantly changed over time ($F = 3.64, p < .05$). In what direction? Or you should refer til the results presented in the table</p> <p>However, I would suggest the paper to be language washed before published.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1

Reviewer #1 mentioned the following: The current manuscript is a carefully designed qualitative study about the barriers and facilitators for exercising after breast cancer surgery. The article is well written and fulfils international quality standards.

We thank the reviewer for taking precious time to read our manuscript and provide constructive feedback. We have read comments from Reviewer #1 and implemented in our revised manscript.

Comment #1. Methods section, page 6, lines 48 to 60 into page 7, lines 4-6, paragraph "Patient and Public Involvement": In my personal opinion, this paragraph does not add any substantial value to the article and is too much storytelling for a research article.

Response #1. We thank the reviewer for this important comment. As recommended, the section is revised now to make the points succinctly (pages 5-7) and a sentence is added in the contributorship statement (page 18).

Comment #2. Methods section, page 8, lines 48 60 into page 9, line 4, paragraph "Characteristics of Researchers": I understand that this paragraph is supposed to raise the credibility of this project by referring to the experience and expertise of the researchers involved. However, I do not think that this adds substantial value to this article. The methodological quality of your study speaks for itself.

Response #2. We thank the reviewer for this comment. As recommended, we have now deleted this section. Then, we have added some information about researchers in revised PPI section.

Comment #3. Methods section: After reading the article, there is still one thing which is not 100% clear to me: Did the patients receive any exercise recommendations respectively exercise support at any time of the study?

Response #3. No consultation was provided during the course of the study. However, we did not prohibit participants from exercise of any kind if they choose to do it, either. After all the interviews were completed, the exercise recommendation was made individually as a compensation for the participation. To make this point clear, we revised the sentence (pages 6).

Comment #4. Discussion section, page 17, line 30: You wrote, "There was no disagreeing among the participants...". I would suggest phrasing it differently, in a positive instead of a negative way: E.g. "The participants agreed..."

Response #4. The sentence is revised now in a positive form (pages 15-16).

Comment #5. Conclusion section, page 19: I miss one key point in your conclusion, namely the patients' need for homogeneous exercise recommendations throughout all health care professions and hence the need to educate all health care professionals who are in contact with breast cancer patients about the current state of knowledge regarding exercising after BCS.

Response #5. In "clinical implications" section, we added the important aspect of the education and emphasis among the health care professionals (pages 16-17).

Reviewer #2

Review #2 mentioned the following: The current study investigated the factors related to exercise promotion within one month after BCS. Additionally, the authors also aimed to complement the intentions expressed in the interviews quantitative data on PA. The paper is interesting and well-written and includes both qualitative data and quantitative data on physical activity level from before surgery and three times after surgery.

We thank Reviewer #2 for taking precious time to read our submitted manuscript and provide positive and constructive feedback. We have responded to the comments point-by-point manner below.

Comment #1. One minor comment concerning the statistical analysis - the analysis performed is limited described - please describe what type of analysis you have performed in more detail.

Response #1. We thank the reviewer for this important point. We conducted repeated measure ANOVA, as was stated in the "analysis" section.

Comment #2. In the result section report that "Analysis revealed that the total PA level statistically significantly changed over time ($F = 3.64$, $p < .05$). In what direction? Or you should refer to the results presented in the table.

Response #2. We thank the reviewer for this important point. We have used repeated measure ANOVA. To understand, at which time point, the total PA recovered to the pre-surgery levels, we now added results of paired t-test. This is addressed in Table 4 as well as in the text; 'results' section (pages 9-10).

Comment #3. I would suggest the paper to be language washed before published.

Response #3. We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The revised manuscript is proofread by two native English speakers as suggested.