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Reviewer’s report:

This literature review summarizes factors for maintaining healthy behaviors for patients with a changed lifestyle. It is a very interesting and valuable study. After reviewing this manuscript I have some ‘minor essential revisions’.

Abstract:

I. Explain: ‘Physical activity was the dominant behavior’ what does the author mean with dominant behavior

Introduction:

II. I refer to the work in that research area of Jacobs Nele. Two interesting articles are:


III. A distinction between primary and secondary prevention has to be made. Lifestyle changes and adherence is better in the case of secondary prevention than it is in primary prevention (healthy persons). The selection criteria of this study are patients with secondary prevention (see methods).

IV. ‘... are relevant to these particular populations.’ Explain what do you mean with these particular populations.

V. Page 6 ‘separately instead of separate’?

Methods:

VI. Is the quality assessment tool for the selection of the papers based on a validated questionnaire? If so specify. Idem ditto for the categorizing of quality criteria: arbitrary?

Results:

VII. 23 papers are selected and 723 participants were recruited. So I can
conclude that it studies are rather small (=low number of participants) -> +/-31 participants per study? Please discuss this in your discussion section.

Discussion:

VIII. Authors refer to multiple lifestyle factors, I hereby refer to work done in the PreCardio study where a composite lifestyle change score was measured.

IX. Another limitation of the selected studies in this review is the limited number of participants per study.

Conclusion:

X. ‘In delivering this type of support there needs to be better integration between health and social care’. What does the authors mean with this statement. It comes suddenly in the text …

XI. Wellbeing boards: What is this?

XII. Overall the conclusion is a ‘stand alone’ conclusion. The text is incoherent and brings no added value at the article. In my opinion the conclusion can end with ‘… to everyday living.’

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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