Reviewer's report

Title: Acculturation does not necessarily lead to increased physical activity during leisure time: a cross-sectional study among Turkish migrants in the Netherlands

Version: 1 Date: 7 May 2007

Reviewer: David Berrigan

Reviewer's report:

General: Neat topic, but the presentation is not so compelling

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

I am not convinced by this paper that you have measured the three simple constructs illustrated in Figure 1 in a discrete way that allows your stratified logistic regression models to test the scheme outlined in said figure. I think that cultural orientation and contextual barriers as you define and measure them are likely to be all mixed up and correlated in some complex way.

Given that, Maybe a simpler and more descriptive approach would work better. E.g. "Leisure time PA increases with language acculturation in turkish immigrants except in respondents with children". So I would say a bit more work is needed to make your results more transparent and compelling. Along these same lines 'contextual barriers' seems to include at least two very different things i.e children vs occupation vs built environment. Why not just treat and discuss each separately? E.g. "Three factors moderated the association between acculturation and LTPA: 1) Children,... 2) Occupational PA... and 3) Neighborhood characteristics... " Then you could discuss and explain these in turn.

I wonder where the 4 met cutoff for vigorous activity comes from (p.8), many other authors use 6 or 7.

Sometimes you say 'Dutch people' and sometimes you say 'ethnic Dutch people' are turks living in holland Dutch? What about the children or grand children of immigrants? better be very careful to be consistent about this and think carefully about what you want to communicate, implicitly and explicitly.

The concept of language alone as a measure of acculturation has been criticized. So you might be a little more scholarly in your discussion of this concept in reference to your measure of acculturation (e.g. on p. 13)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Your reference list is a bit sloppy, minor point, but it calls into question the care you take with the rest of your work. For example, you forgot to delete the "RefType: Report output of RefMan

and are all the refs you cite needed?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Finally you could cite a couple of my salient papers (if you want)


What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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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